

THE
ANDOVER REVIEW:
A RELIGIOUS AND THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. I.—MAY, 1884.—No. V.

THE CHRISTIAN CONCEPTION OF MAN.

WHAT is man? What is his meaning and his final purpose? Every philosophy, every theology, every religion must give some answer. It is not too much to say that their value may be gauged by the answer they furnish. If Christianity is to vindicate its claim to absolute truth, we shall expect from it also an adequate response.

It must be a thoroughly Christian response. To look at man from any lower point of view than that proper to Christianity as distinctively the religion of Christ would be a confession of failure. The problem of humanity can be solved only in the light of Christ's revelation. The scientific, archæological, and ethical discussions which form the bulk of that division of our systematic theologies denominated anthropology have their value in their place, but in no sense do they furnish a Christian doctrine of man. Theology has here a greater work to do.

It is the object of this article to show that in *the idea of sonship revealed by Christ* are to be found the distinctive features of the Christian conception of man. It is not asserted that this idea includes all the truth which Christianity has taught man concerning himself. As Christianity itself is larger than any system of doctrine, so the Christian conception of man is larger than any single form of scriptural or doctrinal representation. But upon no other form has Christianity so deeply stamped its meaning. The Fatherhood of God gives us the truest and most comprehensive conception of the divine nature. The sonship of man is its pregnant correlate.

Our examination of the subject must start from the Person of the Redeemer. The Incarnate Son is the perfect Revelation. As

in Him God is revealed in his true character, so that He could say, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," so humanity is revealed in Him in its true meaning. To know Christ is to know man in his perfection; it is to catch the divine secret of his essential being. Now, since Christ was divine, we might expect that his life in manhood would manifest and illustrate humanity pre-eminently upon the side on which it is allied to God, namely, in the moral and spiritual life. Accordingly, we find in Him the realization of man's true relation to his Maker as a son or child of God, a revelation at once of human capacity, duty, and destiny. What is the nature of this sonship? In a word, fellowship with God and moral and spiritual likeness to Him. It has its deep, unfailing springs in the prevenient love of the divine Father. It is the manifestation of a corresponding love. Its vital element is a personal, intimate knowledge of God. It involves trust, dependence, perfect obedience. Its meat is to do the will of the Father in Heaven. It does not exclude, nay rather it requires, a process of moral development, in which temptations withstood and discipline cheerfully undergone, in the freedom of an uncoerced will, yet only through the power of the Father, take a prominent place. It voices its communion and its needs in prayer. It glorifies the Father by making known his perfections in the mirror of a filial life, and the testimony of a filial love. Not least — may we not even say greatest — it manifests itself in the love of brotherhood to all whom the Father loves, devoting itself in absolute self-sacrifice to the task of restoring his other children to his fellowship. It was this perfect revelation of sonship that received the seal of the Father's approval at the great crises of the Saviour's ministry, "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased." And here we need not hesitate to employ, as explicative of Christ's filial humanity, the title Son of God. It is true that it belongs to Him in a special and unique sense, in which no man can share it with Him. The New Testament teaches the metaphysical oneness of the Son with the Father, clearly distinguishing his preëxistent divine nature from our human nature, into which He entered at the incarnation, and calling Him in this higher sense the Son. But granting all this, it is also true that the term Son designates that characteristic in the eternal relations of God which can be exhibited in manhood and imitated by men. The essential relation must indeed underlie the personal and spiritual relation. It is unique, transcendent, incomprehensible. But the conceptions of Fatherhood and sonship give us that which is comprehensible, capable of revela-

tion not only to humanity, but in humanity and of being copied by humanity. When God made men in his own image, He made them capable of entering into a relation to Him like that in which the divine Son had eternally stood to the divine Father. He provided from the first for a unique revelation of sonship in humanity, in which the eternal relation should be manifested, not partially but perfectly, in One who should be at once Son of God and Son of Man, who should stand in such a central and universal relation to the race that in Him the divine and the human sonship should be forever united and all things in heaven and earth reconciled through Him. Father and Son are not terms that hide, but terms that reveal. We forget that the person of Christ is of itself the highest revelation, when we thrust back into the incomprehensibilities of an eternal metaphysical relation these names so luminous with spiritual meaning, which were intended to give us the saving knowledge of God. Nor may we ignore the probable fact that though, from the first, God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, yet it was only through the consciousness of a moral and spiritual sonship won by obedience to his Father's will that the profounder consciousness dawned upon Him of his eternal oneness with God. We do not, therefore, when we say with Paul, "God sent his Son, that we might receive the adoption of sons," employ incommensurate terms, but rather express in its highest conception that filial relation which constitutes men "partakers of the divine nature."

In the light of Christ's person and teachings we have revealed to us the actual state of man as a sinner. Sin, as has been truly said, is not a doctrine but a fact. The Bible spends little time explaining its nature and origin and its place in the divine plan. Christianity takes sin as it finds it, an awful reality, and goes to work to remove it. Christ, by his revelation of sonship, makes known at once the essential character and the guilt of sin. It is the complete opposite of sonship. The sinful spirit is the contradiction of the filial spirit. It defeats the divine purpose in man, putting self in the place the Father ought to have, and substituting pride and self-sufficiency for humble trust and dependence. It makes communion with God impossible. There is, indeed, a natural sonship of which no man can divest himself. By virtue of creation and by their original spiritual likeness to their Maker, as well as by their capacity for the communion of love with Him, all are his children. The Bible begins with the doctrine of the divine image in man. Christ, in the Sermon on the

Mount, taught the universal Fatherhood of God. Paul, standing on the Areopagus, illumined with new meaning the words of the heathen Aratus "We are his offspring." The divine image is inalienable. One of the mediæval theologians said of it, "Even in hell, though it may burn, it cannot be destroyed." It is the essential element of manhood. It is the pre-supposition and point of attachment for redemption. But the manhood revealed by Christ was something higher than this. The natural sonship is only the starting-point for the moral and spiritual. The latter must be achieved in the intercourse of loving union with the Father. And consequently, since the sinner is alienated and separated from God, he can in no true sense be called his child. And yet, since the divine voice speaks in his conscience and proclaims his relationship to his Father and his duty to Him; he knows himself to be guilty. He wanders in the world his Father has given him, a child who has sold his birthright of life and blessedness, orphaned by his own evil choice. There is an unsolved antinomy in his life. He is out of harmony with himself, his fellow-men, and the world, since he is out of harmony with his heavenly Father. Of all beings in the universe his condition is the most pitiable. If the Christian conception of man tried to grasp his essence as it finds him in the state of sin, it would end, as the human philosophies and even the religions do, in hopeless failure. Our prevalent scientific philosophy tries at the same time to do justice to the fact of sin and yet to explain it as no sin at all, only partially evolved conduct, and between the two stools it falls to the ground. Christianity, having found the meaning of sin in the revelation in Christ, goes on to further complete its conception of man by its doctrine of redemption by Christ.

The atonement has for its object to bring men into that spiritual sonship to God which Christ has shown to belong to the true idea of humanity. It recognizes the fact that there is a true sense in which men are unable, since they are sinners, to obtain their birthright. There are two parties in this relation, and therefore there must be reconciliation. Horace Bushnell has somewhere spoken in his inimitable way of the divine tact and consideration for mankind which led God to save men by a man. But it was more than a condescension of divine love; it was a necessity of spiritual law. Only the perfect and universal Man could reconcile God and men. Only by a complete human experience, or rather, only by such a human experience as was possible to the Son of Man, the central Man, could He so enter into the solidarity of the race as to

become its true spiritual head and representative, and so make its peace with God. The divine Son wrought out in human life a perfect sonship, in which the divine and the human were inseparably blended. It was likewise the perfect realization of brotherhood with men. It was not merely the physical and natural oneness of the Saviour with mankind that gave Him his capacity as a Redeemer, but that personal oneness which was the result of his life of filial obedience to his Father's will of redemption, and in virtue of which He became in all points like his brethren. Not alone with reference to the resurrection body did Paul say, "The first man Adam became a living soul. The last Adam became a life-giving spirit." In Christ a new spiritual power was revealed in manhood for the redemption of men. It is in the high region of his personality, where the divine and the human were perfectly one in the realization of the filial relation with the Father and the brotherly relation with man, that the atonement reveals its profoundest meaning. So long as we rise no higher than the moral sphere, and attempt to illustrate the atonement by legal analogies, we fail to catch the secret of its efficacy. But when we see in the Saviour's sufferings and death the perfecting of his sonship in humanity and his brotherhood with men, the reason begins to dawn upon us why it avails to bring many sons into glory. It was more than example, more than the manifestation of that Fatherly love of God which has power to soften the obdurate heart. In his perfect filial obedience, faithful even unto the death of the cross, Christ verily made propitiation for human sin, since in it He manifested at once the divine displeasure towards sin and the divine will of mercy towards mankind, thus declaring God's righteousness and honoring his holy law.

And so it comes that in the Christian conception of man the true manhood is conditioned by redemption. The Son of God has vindicated the right of sonship for humanity, for He has made the filial relation once more possible. His death is a pledge to God and men of that possibility. And now in the divine economy of grace the Father's favor is given to the sinner without the need of waiting till it has been won by him. Christ himself has won it for every soul who will accept Him for its Saviour; the Son of God has won it from God, the Son of Man for men. By faith, on the ground of his atonement, men may come into the filial relation with their heavenly Father, and be accepted by Him and made partakers with Christ of his love and favor. In the legal phrase which Paul, fresh from the teaching of the Jewish law, so

often used, God justifies the sinner, — that is, accepts him as if he were righteous, in order that he may achieve righteousness. In another phrase, also Pauline, which tenderly presents the same truth under the conception of sonship, God adopts the sinner, taking him to be his child and endowing him with all filial privileges, in order that he may become in heart and life a son. Nor does this objective act of God's grace stand alone. There is an inward change wrought, no less indispensable to the realization of the life of sonship. The subjective complement of the divine justification or adoption is regeneration, the new birth. In the depths of the soul, where lie its ultimate springs of action, the divine Spirit and the human will — in one complex act which none but a superficial philosophy dare claim to have analyzed — together work a new purpose, a choice of God as the supreme end, a union with the Father through the Son. It is a change that is an entire revolution, a new creation. Through the birth-throes of this great crisis the child of God is born, the soul enters into the new life of filial love and receives the spirit of adoption whereby it cries, Abba, Father. And now the true manhood is begun. As Martensen says, "The ego in man, his personal identity, is the same in essence after regeneration as it was before; but by regeneration the essential principle of the ego is realized." Up to this time the Christian conception of manhood has been only a possibility. In the new birth it has come into real existence. He who falls short of the filial relation to God falls short of manhood as Christ defined it and made it possible. But the adopted and regenerate child of God, though he be the veriest infant in spiritual things, has entered into the heritage of the true humanity. He looks out upon a new horizon. He lives in a new world.

But the Christian conception of man remains spiritually and ethically imperfect, if we look merely at the genesis of the new life. The realization of sonship is along the line of a process of religious and moral development which presses forward to perfection. That selfish and unworthy view of Christianity which stops short with its negative aspects, and emphasizes chiefly the relief from punishment it affords, is based upon a total misconception of its nature. As well represent natural birth solely in the light of an escape from death, and ignore the life and growth of which it is the beginning. Justification and regeneration are not a goal, but a starting-point. They are not ends in themselves, but means to a far higher end. Christian salvation has for its aim nothing less than to redeem men from the power of sin and to bring them into

conformity with the perfect manhood in Jesus Christ. It cannot rest satisfied with the rights and privileges of sonship, but must also have the reality of it. And the process by which this result is reached conforms to the principles which underlie the Christian conception as we have thus far discovered it. Christ setting the example, Christ furnishing the power, are the two facts that regulate the Christian life. The Saviour's life drew its inspiration and power from his communion with his Father. The disciple's life is hid with Christ in God. He is united with the Father and the Son in loving fellowship. He abides in Christ as the branch in the vine. Christ's Spirit is the power that moulds his life. And yet in it all there is nothing merely physical or magical. The personal Father enters into personal communion with his child. The mystical union with Christ is a personal union of conscious reciprocity. The indwelling of the Spirit is the personal abiding of the Father and the Son in the soul. It is the bane of theology that it is forever going down into the sphere of the physical to explain the spiritual, forgetting that the analogies of force and unconscious life-processes which it employs can only incompletely and figuratively express the higher truths with which it deals. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Here are two wholly different realms. The life of sonship is a life of personal fellowship with God. A fellowship of faith, it is true, and not of sight. Still faith is a real knowledge. It apprehends its object and experiences its reality. It belongs to the region of certitude, not of conjecture or probability. The prayer in which it finds its natural utterance is not a casting of vain words into an empty air, but a real communing with the Father of spirits and the Saviour of souls. The first truth of the new life is the personal presence of God and the power of intimate and filial converse with Him. And here lies the secret of the perennial power of the Christian conception of man. It grasps the essence of humanity at the highest point, namely, in man's personal and spiritual relations to God, and thus it necessarily comprehends all the lower elements in human development. Redemption begins at the top and works down. The ethical and the physical cannot but partake of the regeneration of the spiritual. Set a man right with God, and keep him right; let him grow in intimacy and fellowship with the Father and His Son Jesus Christ; and the lower ranges of his life cannot but be affected and progressively brought into subjection to the higher. It is the low and imperfect theory of Christianity which leaves out of view the

necessity of personal union with God, letting religion stiffen into formalism, and faith degenerate into intellectual assent to doctrine, that permits a defective morality and a barren life. But the more the filial spirit is formed within, the more the whole nature and activities of the man become conformed to the ideal of a complete Christian manhood. The life of love to God realizes itself in obedience. Dependence upon the Father and acquiescence in his will become the spiritual atmosphere of the soul. Temptations, trials, discipline work together for good. Selfishness is progressively overcome. The love of sonship begets the love of brotherhood. Those virtues and beauties of character which belong to the lower ideal of manhood manifest themselves and are sanctified and elevated to Christian graces. Gradually Christ is formed within, the image of the well-beloved Son impressed in deep, clear outlines upon the filial life.

But the Christian conception of man is capable of a larger application. We pass from the ethics of the individual to the ethics of society. Mankind in its broader relations comes within the scope of Christianity, which aims at the rehabilitation of the race as a whole. The designation Christ ordinarily gives this broader destination of man is the kingdom of God. But the idea of the kingdom is only formally different from that of sonship. The Sovereign is at the same time the Father. The principles of the divine government in the kingdom, so far as it relates to the children of God, are the principles of Fatherhood. The exalted Lord of the kingdom is the divinely-human Son, made Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead. The establishment of the kingdom on earth advances precisely in proportion to the acknowledgment of God's Fatherhood and the sway of filial love. It is to "Our Father which art in Heaven" that Christ has taught us to pray "Thy kingdom come!" More and more, as in the progress of doctrine in the New Testament the Jewish mode of thought yields to that universalism which is characteristic of Christianity, the kingdom falls into the background and the filial relation takes its place. But the truth it embodies remains in full power, the idea of an organized humanity doing God's work in the world, spreading his truth, working out his triumph. God's Fatherhood, man's sonship in the exalted Son, the brotherhood of men, — in principle and hope for all men, in reality for all believers in Jesus Christ, — this one idea in triple correlates, dominates the Christian conception of humanity, and gives the scope of Christian effort. It has from the earliest days of Christianity set

the problem of humanity in a new light. "God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son," — "That we might receive the adoption of sons," — "And this commandment have we from Him, that he who loveth God love his brother also," — these are the truths that can effect the regeneration of mankind. In virtue of them Christianity has been able to lay hold upon the great teleological organs of society, shaping them to its use, so as to secure the organization of religious and moral power, and to bring the activities of the race more and more under its sway.

First of all, the *Family*. It is not correct to say that God has taken the analogy of the parental and filial relation to figure forth his eternal relation to the Logos, and his relation to us through Jesus Christ. Rather He created mankind upon the eternal model, and made the parental relation an image of the heavenly things, that it might ever turn men's hearts in loving trust to himself. From the Christian point of view, the family is the human unit, — not the bare unity of isolated individuality, which has no separate right of existence according to the Christian principle, but the organized unit, involving in its oneness multiplicity of members and variety of functions, here, too, like that unity of God which is manifold. As sin has gained its power in the world through heredity, so is grace to win its triumphs largely thus. Christianity accomplishes its best work in the home, where the human filial love is so readily transformed into love to the heavenly Father. If the Church Catholic, in vindicating for the children of the Christian household the right to that seal of God's Fatherly grace which is the sign of participation in the privileges of the children of God, cannot lay its finger upon a direct command, it has certainly caught the deepest meaning of Christianity and applied one of its truest principles. Christian nurture has still greater triumphs to achieve for Christ, when — as must be the case sooner or later — we shall have receded from that individualistic conception of humanity which obscures half the truth of the New Testament teachings respecting the family, and shall have restored to its place the Christian idea in its full meaning and beauty.

And next, *Religion*. For this Christianity has produced its adequate instrumentality in the church, the earthly agency by which the advancement of the kingdom of God is effected, as the family is the earthly agency for perpetuating it among men. Here, also, the constitutive principles are sonship and brotherhood. In the New Testament ideal the visible church is through and

through permeated by the invisible. The former, as an outward and operative institution, must derive all its efficiency from the latter. It belongs to the essence of the church that it is a company of sons in living communion with the Father and with each other through the glorified Son. Its means of grace, its sacraments, its worship have for their object to draw closer the bonds of sonship and brotherhood. All else is of subordinate importance. The particular polity is a means to the higher end, serviceable just so far as it attains that end. "There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." Papacy, prelacy, presbytery, independency are to be judged by the success with which they carry out these objects and bring in more fully the kingdom of God. The same conception shapes the work of the church. Within, the brethren labor for each others' good, that all may attain unto the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ, — manhood, brotherhood, sonship in the knowledge of the Son. Without lies the world, God's wandering children, the Christian's brethren in possibility and hope, to be won for Christ. Here is revealed the missionary destination of the church, which will not cease until the race is united in brotherhood under the Father in heaven. Truly a grander thought has never illumined the human mind.

Nor does the Christian conception of man leave out of view the other organs by which the great functions of society are performed. The state, the school, science, art, all come within its scope. There is no distinction of secular and religious in the Christian idea. The eternal Son created those needs and activities in man from which these institutions have grown. Their archetypes existed in his eternal creative thought. They were made by Christ and for Christ. At last they must receive their Christian meaning. The constant recognition which the Bible gives to the *State*, as a divine institution, is most significant. Not even in the apostolic days, when Christianity and the world confronted each other in the sharpest contrast, is one word uttered of revolution or opposition. The powers that be are ordained of God. The principles of Christianity could, in their own peaceful but irresistible way, take possession of human government just in proportion as they should take possession of mankind. The more the fundamental ideas of the kingdom of God come to be the living, operative

forces in the world, the more must the earthly kingdoms feel their transforming influence. Christianity carries within it the power of healing all abuses and righting all wrongs, and pledges its truth that the time will come — though it may be far off, very far off — when the Fatherhood of God and the love of Christ shall be the moving powers of human government, when wars shall cease, and human brotherhood be universally acknowledged. The *School* also falls under the domination of the Christian principle. It stands between the family and the church as one of the most powerful instrumentalities in training children for the divine Father. Christianity, it is true, lays its first claim upon the spiritual and religious in man, but it takes into its ideal of sonship, likewise, the intellectual and the physical. It must lay its hallowing touch upon every faculty of man, and bring all into subjection to Christ. Unsanctified intellect, unsanctified power are Satan's chief instrumentalities. The spirit that would not merely deliver the school from the power of sectarianism, but also unchristianize it, is at variance with that of Christ. And, lastly, we may not in this survey ignore *Science* and *Art*. Truth and beauty are divine, and therefore they are Christian. Even heathen thought has recognized the correlation of the true and the beautiful with the good. The love of them is an evidence of the divine in us. In Christ are hidden all treasures of wisdom and of knowledge. He is the soul of all beauty. It is true we can see now in the world about us but dim traces of the lineaments of the Son of God. We behold truth but in fragments, and beauty but in glimpses that tantalize us, while they draw us onward and amaze us with the thought of the perfect truth and beauty that are somewhere in the universe, that are really in the Son of God. But in the progress of true science and art more and more fully Christ and the Father will be revealed to men and will impress their image on mankind.

Along this line of thought we are brought to the Christian doctrine of man's final destiny. Here likewise the idea of sonship is formative of our theological thought. Whether we look at the individual or the race, the dominant principles which have already guided us still direct our faith. First of all, the guaranty of individual immortality lies in man's natural relation of sonship to God. It is the image of the Father in the soul, the free spiritual personality, so different from anything in nature, so great in its powers and its possibilities, that forces upon us the conviction, apart from Revelation, that we are not merely natural existences

but partakers of that eternity which belongs to God himself. And there is a true sense in which Christ, by that revelation of sonship which was characteristic of his wondrous human personality, brought life and immortality to light for all men. But we have to do here not so much with man's natural likeness to God as with the new humanity which Christ has made possible. Sonship and eternal life, as Christ used the terms, are synonymous. To know the only true God and Jesus Christ whom He hath sent, this is life. The perfected son must abide forever with the Father. He is an heir of the ages, since he is the child of the Highest, and the joint-heir with the well-beloved Son. The love that led to the sacrifice of the Only-begotten cannot stop short of the full development and perfection of the child bought with the price of his sufferings and death. Christian theology and ethics alike find their consummation in this perfect good. The redeemed son has attained his chief end; he glorifies God and enjoys Him forever. It is not the enjoyment of mere pleasure, the merely subjective happiness; of that there is no lack indeed; but that does not give us the essential character of the heavenly life. That which is highest in sonship is communion with the Father and the Elder Brother, and serving them in the blessed obedience of love. The beatific vision is not the ecstasy of rapt delight. It is the seeing face to face, knowing even as also we are known, living in the full intimacy of the glorious Ones, doing their glorious will. And conversely, the fate of those who fall short of God's purpose of love is elucidated by the same principle. To miss sonship is to miss eternal life. The words of doom are, "I never knew thee. Depart from me!" If the meaning of Heaven is found in communion with the Father, the meaning of retribution is found in separation from Him.

And so we are brought to the destiny of the race. The last scene is unrolled before us in the drama of prophetic revelation. Second coming, resurrection, judgment, consummation. The Son is revealed in the power and glory of the Father. The physical nature of man, last to be reached in the order of salvation, is made like to Christ, — the physical manifestation of sonship, or, as Paul puts it, the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body. The Son appears as the Judge, and sonship is made the criterion of judgment. All wrongs are righted, all evil is removed. The creation itself also is delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God. There are new heavens and a new earth.

As the Christian conception begins with sonship, so in sonship it reaches the utmost verge of its vision. Even the apostle of the eagle eye, who gazed unflinchingly upon the glories of the world unseen, bids us here to cease our inquiries. "Beloved, now are we children of God, and it is not yet made manifest what we shall be. We know that, if He shall be manifested, we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him even as He is. And every one that hath this hope set on him purifieth himself even as He is pure."

Lewis F. Stearns.

THE FATE OF SYMBOLS — ILLUSTRATIONS FROM MATHEMATICS.

"What perishes in the general struggle which throbs through all history is the limitation of the individual and the limitation of the nation."

God in History, by C. C. J. BARON BUNSEN.

It has often been said of arithmetic and algebra, as of analysis in general, that they relieve the mind of effort by converting a mental into a mechanical process. In the use of their symbolic language errors may be made and wrong conclusions drawn, as in the language of ordinary life. But these errors are clerical, orthographical, as it were, due rather to careless writing than careless thinking, and are corrected by the eye without mental exertion. Having once mastered the grammar, the intellect is thereafter relieved of labor and manipulates signs as it could not notions. While this is in the main true, this labor-saving machine of the intellect, which like other machines enables it to accomplish what were otherwise impossible, is the creation of the intellect itself, and a creation which has cost it no little effort. However mechanical the applications of the sign-language which results from a substitution of symbols for ideas, the substitution itself has been far from a mechanical process and has a history quite independent of the results to which it has led, — a history of which the curt definitions of the text-books give no hint. This development, moreover, has been characterized by methods of which the ordinary deductive processes of the applied science know nothing. If Sir William Hamilton, when he said, "Of observation, experiment, induction, analogy, the mathematician knows nothing," meant the mathematician, and not the mathematical engineer or mathematical physicist, it would be sufficient to point to his great

namesake, observing, experimenting, hazarding conjectures even, in the inner world as the biologist does in that without. Illustrations of this fact would not be without interest, but would lead us too far from our subject.

There is another misconception, growing out of such definitions as that "mathematics is the science which draws necessary conclusions." If the physicist furnish definite data, it will undoubtedly draw therefrom certain necessary conclusions; but it has also its own data, which, though arbitrarily imposed, it has nevertheless repeatedly found occasion to modify. It does not, therefore, present that character of fixity and permanence with which it is often invested. In an age when change is so rapid as to be frequently identified with instability, and agitation obscures the fact of progress, mathematics have been appealed to as a summit above the tide and beyond the power of the current. It is not necessary, however, to consider the recent proposition to bury Euclid, or to make an excursion into the ghostly realms of n -dimensional space, to find the evidence of change and reconstruction, that is of growth, even in this science whose progress is commonly confounded with that of its applications. This misconception is due to the fact that elementary instruction is more occupied with imparting a knowledge of the use than the evolution of the machine; and, on the other hand, no department of history is so poor in its bibliography as that of mathematics. The great workers in this field are more concerned in the creation of a future than in the explanation of a past, and only genius can fitly undertake this explanation. But aside from its ever increasing correlations with other sciences, the pure science of mathematics itself presents the spectacle of constant growth, the stimulus coming mainly from those departments in which it works. They are ever sending up the cry, "Come over and help us," and while their practical outcome, their telephones, dyes, and motors, their art in short, is not the result of mathematical formulæ, the advance of their philosophy and science is conditioned upon the perfection of the analytical instrument. Its development has been a gradual one. Like development in other sciences, it has encountered obstacles and passed through periods of conflict when it seemed at war with itself and hopelessly involved in contradictions; for the same structural laws of the mind govern the evolution of concepts, whether they be arbitrary, as in mathematics they seem for a time to be, or whether, as in physics, they are conditioned upon our knowledge of the relations between the material objects of thought. The

definitions, and symbols of the one, like the theories of the other, are in a state of flux, and both flow under the same laws of intellectual progress. It is here proposed to exhibit this growth as it has actually occurred, confining ourselves, however, to a single, and that the simplest, line of progress.

We derive the idea of unity from the contemplation of any single object, and the simplest definition of number is that of aggregates obtained by adding unity first to itself, and then, successively, to the aggregate last attained. This process has no limit and may at any time be reversed, the reverse process being subtraction. So defined, numbers may be added in any order and under any mode of grouping; whence the commutative and associative laws of addition. The *repetition* of any one number gives rise to the process of multiplication. As a process of equal additions, it is identical in nature with that of the successive addition of unity; the associative, commutative, and distributive laws of multiplication, therefore, follow immediately. The converse operation, division, has for its object the separation of a number into a given number of equal parts, and the determination of the value of one of these parts.

The simplest definition of a fraction results from the subdivision of unity into equal parts, the denominator indicating their number, and the numerator the number taken. It may here be objected that fractions are not numbers in the sense of the previous definition. And so they are not, if number is restricted to simple aggregates of unity. Its meaning must be so extended as to include aggregates of the subordinate units into which unity is divided. With this proviso, fractions may be added and subtracted, understanding by addition and subtraction processes which seek such a fraction of unity as shall measure the sum or difference of the fractions of unity to be added or subtracted. Moreover, since the denominator of a fraction expresses a part of unity which may be repeated, the multiplication or division of a fraction by a whole number is simply the multiplication or division of its numerator.

But, as yet, the definitions of multiplication and division exclude the use of a fraction as a multiplier or divisor, for the former operation has for its object the repetition of a number as many times as there are units in the multiplier; and the latter, its separation into as many equal parts as there are units in the divisor, — operations which are unintelligible if the multiplier or divisor is a fraction. The original definition must, then, be made

more comprehensive, if the operations previously limited to whole numbers are to be extended to fractions.

Number is therefore redefined as the result of comparing a quantity with any other of the same kind; that is, as a ratio. Multiplication now becomes a process of finding a number related to the multiplicand in the same way that the multiplier is related to unity; and the modified definition of division is, the process of finding a number which, multiplied by the divisor, reproduces the dividend. The necessity for the restatement of these operations is obvious. Multiplication, for example, was before a process which always increased the multiplicand, but which, now that the multiplier is fractional, may render it smaller. In fact, all the rules before established must be reconsidered in the light of the new definition. The terminology itself has acquired a totally different significance. Thus the word *times*, previously indicating the repetition of the same act, undergoes an extension of meaning when carried over into this new process of fractional multiplication. The definition of a fraction itself requires modification. As indicating only the separation of unity into equal parts and the taking of a certain number of them, it restricts both the number of the subordinate parts and the value of one of them to whole numbers. But such is no longer the necessary meaning of number. Hence the necessity for the revision of all operations on fractions, for the purpose of showing the possible reduction of all processes involving complex fractions to the case in which their terms are entire; that is, the reduction of the fractions themselves to a common unit. This is important in view of what follows.

It may be here noticed in passing that, at this early stage of development, a conception arises, the elucidation of which is usually reserved for a later period, — the conception of a limit. The fraction $\frac{1}{12}$, for example, expresses the division of unity into twelve equal parts, and the taking of eleven of them. But if we seek to express it as a ratio in terms of tenths, hundredths, etc., of unity, we have .91666 . . . , a variable number which increases constantly, and yet, under the law of increase assigned it, never reaches a certain fixed and definite value. This value is its limit. Now while the conception of a limit finds its principal use in the higher mathematics, and is so generally reserved till required for service, it and other like conceptions ought to be rendered familiar to the student when they first arise. Not, indeed, that they should there be pressed into immediate service, but they should, as far

as practicable, be explained. For a clear and connected view of symbols and operations is best secured by studying them as they occur in the philosophical development of the science. To defer their presentation is to reproduce the gaps and delays which attended the actual historical growth, to leave the mind groping among the difficulties which beset their evolution, and to render abrupt and disconnected what should be continuous and natural.

The above illustration of a limit shows that, if we extend to fractions the process applied to number as previously defined, namely, its division into subordinate units, we are likely to encounter a difficulty. In other words, it may prove impossible to express the fraction in terms of any number whatsoever of the units assigned. Or, to state the case in another way, suppose the squares of the entire numbers 1, 2, 3, . . . , to be formed. These squares, 1, 4, 9, . . . , will differ from each other by more than unity. Hence the square roots of the whole numbers which are comprised between these squares must lie between the corresponding numbers 1, 2, 3, . . . ; that is, they must be fractions. But no fraction, unless it be a whole number in disguise, to whatever power it may be raised, can yield a whole number. Hence, so far as our definition of number is concerned, these numbers have no square roots. The only escape from such an anomaly is to admit into the fraternity of number the ratios of such numbers as have no common measure. These incommensurable ratios obtrude themselves in the course of our investigations, and cannot be ignored; like that of the diagonal and side of a square, which refuse to be measured by any common unit we may assign to them, and which indeed may be proved to have no such common unit of measure. And it would be well for circle-squarers, who, as De Morgan observes,¹ never try "to cross the square," to observe that the circumference and diameter of a circle have in like manner been proved to have no common unit of measure.

Here, again, an extension of meaning of the word number requires the revision of previous definitions, operations, and nomenclature. We must, for example, redefine *equality* as affirmed of incommensurable ratios.²

To abbreviate and generalize the statements of arithmetic, signs and letters were soon employed, giving rise to the formulæ of what Newton called Universal Arithmetic. Its letters a , b , x , etc., are

¹ *A Budget of Paradoxes*, p. 321.

² See *Des Méthodes dans les Sciences de Raisonnement*, Duhamel, Part II. ch. vi.

erroneously termed quantities. They are obviously not the quantities themselves referred to in the problems, nor are they symbols for them; they are symbols for the numbers which measure them. In short, they are general symbols of number, and should be so denominated. The signs $+$ and $-$ of this generalized arithmetic are precisely what they were before, symbols of operation only, indicating addition and subtraction; and none of the laws governing the transformation of the expressions arising from the substitution of letters for figures suffer any change. We have to deal only with old friends in a new symbolic dress. Since, then, $+$ and $-$ indicate operations only, $+a$, or $-b$, convey no meaning whatever when taken by themselves, and herein lies the distinction between Arithmetic and Algebra, with which latter Literal or Universal Arithmetic is so often confounded.

But while nothing in our definitions thus far takes any notice of these unintelligible combinations, $+a$, or $-b$, the operations grounded on these definitions persist in yielding them as results. They exist, although as yet they have no *raison d'être*. Thus, while the operations of literal arithmetic seem to offer no difficulty, being identical in form with those previously applied to the numbers which the letters represent, it is far otherwise with the interpretation of their results. For how evaluate $a - b$, when a is not adequate to subtract b from? Or how interpret $-b$, or even $+a$, when, in view of the conjunctive meaning which alone is attached to the prefixed signs, these expressions must be terms of a polynomial to convey any meaning whatever? As before, an alien knocks for admission, and admission is evidently conditioned, not only on the extension of the meaning of number, but also on that of the prefixed signs.

The interpretation afforded by the coördinate system of Descartes, confined as it is to geometric quantity, was incomplete, though suggestive, and the difficulty was not fully cleared up before the opening of the present century. Zöllner,¹ Schultze,² and others have shown how much of modern speculation in astronomy and natural history is prefigured in the writings of Kant, and it is in Kant's quantitative and qualitative modes of quantity that the key is found to the interpretation of these isolated monomials affected with the $+$ and $-$ signs. Quantity, affirms Kant, cannot be completely represented without quality. Duration, for example, may be measured, but the representation is incomplete except as we further regard it as a time future or a time past. But, so

¹ *Natur der Kometen.*

² *Kant und Darwin.*

far as the monomials $+a$ and $-b$ are concerned, only antithetical qualities are suggested. Hence the extension of the meaning of these symbols, as representative not only of number, that is of the measure of quantity, but also of its opposite qualities; a and b being symbols, as before, of the number or measure, while the qualities are distinguished by the prefixed signs $+$ and $-$. These symbols, then, become complex symbols, not as representing complex quantities, but as representing both magnitude and quality, and as such they cease to be the symbols of pure number, and become symbols of the two modes of quantity now regarded as extensive and intensive; and as heretofore called numbers, although strictly symbols of number, they may now be termed quantities, although strictly the representatives of quantity considered under the double aspect of quantification and qualification. Thus, for example, $+a$ is a definite amount of future time, $-b$ a definite amount of past time; and the signs which had previously rendered results unintelligible become necessary for their interpretation.

Every symbol is now of the form $+a$, or $-a$, and any polynomial expression, although written $a+b-c$ for the sake of brevity, is really $+a + (+b) + (-c)$. The late Professor Clifford has drawn a very arbitrary distinction between the Science of Quantity and the Science of Pure Number.¹ He defines the Science of Number as "founded on the hypothesis of the distinctness of things," that is, as dealing only with discrete aggregates; while "the Science of Quantity is founded on the totally different hypothesis of continuity," that is, it deals only with continuous aggregates. The distinction between continuous and discrete aggregates is a very obvious and important one, but wherever the "hypothesis" of discontinuity is changed for that of continuity, the measuring number becomes continuous instead of discrete number. A definition cannot restrict number to one hypothesis. It is the measure of quantity, and the quantity may be essentially discrete, as a row of marbles, which excludes altogether the hypothesis of continuity; or it may admit of conception under either hypothesis, like a line, which may be regarded as made up of other finite lines or of points. Thus duration, essentially continuous in nature, may be measured by hours, and so admits of the hypothesis of discontinuity. But the nature of the number which measures duration, or any other quantity, will correspond to the hypothesis under which it is conceived to increase or diminish. Suppose, for example, from having a rate of motion 5, a body acquires a

¹ *Lectures and Essays* (Philosophy of the Pure Sciences), vol. i., p. 337.

rate of motion 6. As a continuous quantity, the velocity passes from the initial velocity 5 to the final velocity 6 by passing through "no end of intermediate states." What becomes of the corresponding measure of this continuously changing velocity during the interval in which it changes from 5 to 6? For it is impossible that there should be any intervening instant when the rate has no corresponding numerical expression. If the line AB , whose length is a , flows and becomes ABC , of length $a + x$, it is measurable throughout the whole interval. Under a hypothesis of discontinuity, we are at liberty to write $a + x = a + 1$; but we are also at liberty to suppose the line to flow continuously from the length a to the length $a + 1$, and to follow mentally the corresponding change in its measure is no more difficult than to follow mentally the change of the line itself. The mere evaluation of $a + x$ for any instant of time, whereby it becomes say $5\frac{1}{2}$, does not affect the law of change. What, indeed, is $\pm x$ in the science of continuous quantity? Not the quantity itself. Not its symbol, however abstract the investigation. The x is its measure, a number, though an abstract one, and $\pm x$ differs from x only as the signs designate also the intensive mode of what is measured. Thus the symbols of the method of fluxions itself are symbols of number; and if continuous number is a fiction, a science of continuous quantity has no meaning. The act of evaluation is a reversion to a definite aggregate, a suspension of the law of change, but has no bearing on that law before or after the instant considered. "Five sevenths of ten," says Clifford, "is nonsense. Let us, then, treat it as if it were sense, and see what comes of it. A repetition of this process, with every impossible operation that occurs, is supposed to lead in time to continuous quantities." The same might be said of all continuous quantity, if its conception is approached in the same way. Repeated bisection of a line, we might say, is "supposed" to lead to continuous quantity. The truth is, Clifford *assumes* the existence of continuous *quantity*, but would have us *realize* completely in thought the ultimate nature of *continuous number*, a conception no more complete in the case of linear distance than in that of number. The assumption of any continuous quantity carries with it the assumption of a corresponding continuous measure, and the distinction to be drawn is the distinction between discontinuity and continuity, not between number and quantity. Professor Clifford refers to the distinction drawn by the ancients, who divided magnitude into two kinds, one continuous ($\tau\omicron$ συνεχές), which they distinguished from the number

which measured it, the other discontinuous (τὸ διαχές), or number itself. But these definitions, aside from the fact that Aristotle (from whom they are quoted) considered time a form of number,¹ belong to a period when no mathematical investigation of continuous quantity, as such, was known, to which the conception of number as continuous could be applied. And how can absolute, indivisible unity enter into such a science of relations? Unity itself is divisible, and divisible without limit, and its constituent elements are as evanescent as those of any phenomenal quantity. We are under no necessity to pass from 5 to 6, distinct as they are from each other, *per saltum*. The chasm can be filled by vanishing fractions, precisely as that between two determinate lines is filled by points. The difficulties which attend the effort to completely conceive of continuity are not in question, but they are no greater in the case of number than in the case of that which it measures. To deny continuity in the former is to assert that, while a line of 5 feet in length can become one of 6 by passing through no end of intermediate lengths, these lengths have no measure.²

Returning to the extension of meaning assigned to negative quantities, it is evident that a reconsideration of the old terminology and a reëxamination of all previous definitions and rules of operation is once more necessary. Addition is obviously a new operation, for it is no longer a purely numerical process. The quantities added are no longer considered only as measurable, and their combination must take into account a difference in quality as well as magnitude. In its application to geometry, for example, this process becomes a stepping back and forth on a directive axis whose two directions correspond to the antithetical qualities of linear quantity. The signs + and — themselves have a complex meaning, as serving not only to distinguish between distance in one direction and that in the opposite, but also as representing new processes of combining quantity; processes which can be called addition and subtraction only as one step in either direction can be said to be combined with another. *Sum* has a new signification, and *equality* comes to mean equivalence in the sense that a series of successive steps in either direction is equivalent to a single step from the initial to the terminal point of motion. All rules of operation must undergo a like modification, for they must be such as to indicate the quality as well as the magnitude of every result.

¹ *Phys.*, iv. 14.

² See Evelin, *Infini et Quantité*, p. 119 et seq.

The choice of the signs $+$ and $-$ to distinguish quantities of opposite qualities arose naturally from the fact that monomials having these signs were the very results which called for interpretation. But it was doubtless not foreseen at the time how happily this choice was to simplify and abbreviate the sign language, by making the same symbol indicative of both the qualitative mode of quantity and the operations to be performed upon it.

As in previously mentioned cases, however, extension of meaning brings with it new limitations. Important as is this last generalization, it fixes at the same time a very arbitrary limit. For while it is possible to consider every quantity under these antithetical aspects of distance north and south, time past and future, strain compressive and tensile, money gained and lost, etc., there are relatively few which, like time, can be conceived of *only* in this way. As a complete science of space, for example, Algebra is inadequate, and Sir William Rowan Hamilton's definition of it as the Science of Pure Time is singularly expressive.

This limitation, clearly foreseen now, was not at first anticipated; but the manner in which it was encountered in the actual operations of the new calculus may be very easily exhibited. It has been observed that all the former terminology, if retained, has acquired a new significance. Factor, product, multiplication, etc., stand for a new order of ideas. Let us examine the word factor. The original subtractive meaning of the negative sign has been retained, but this sign possesses now an additional meaning as an operator, since when written before any quantity, as a , it has the effect of converting that quantity into its opposite. As a factor then, $-a$ performs a double office, changing that on which it operates both as to amount and kind. As these two operations are entirely distinct in nature, the order in which they are performed is immaterial, and the operation symbolized by $(-a) \times (-a)$ may be also expressed by $-a a$, or $-a^2$; or, finally, since every successive application of the sign $-$ is to change either of two qualities into its opposite, by a^2 . But under the new convention, we have only two kinds of any particular quantity, and therefore what has heretofore been designated as a square can arise only from the operations indicated by the following two groups of symbols, $(-a) \times (-a)$, or $(+a) \times (+a)$, from neither of which $-a^2$ can result. It follows, therefore, that negative quantities can have no square roots, and the combination $\sqrt{-a^2}$ has no meaning. A part of the indicated operation may be performed, and the result written $a\sqrt{-1}$, but there remains the unintelligible $\sqrt{-1}$. The most singu-

lar property of this unmeaning symbol is that, when used under the rules which govern our intelligible ones, it leads to results otherwise known to be true. Thus it may be made to yield all the formulæ of plane trigonometry if, as De Morgan quaintly expresses it, it be treated as "a fellow-subject of the other symbols, with a mask over his features."¹ So admitted into our operations, $\sqrt{-1} \times \sqrt{-1}$ becomes -1 for the reason that $\sqrt{a} \times \sqrt{a} = a$, and analogy at once suggests an interpretation of this so-called imaginary. For inasmuch as $\sqrt{-1}$ when used *twice* as a factor appears from the above to be equivalent to -1 , whose effect is to reverse the quality of a magnitude, when used but *once* it should produce but *half* that effect. But if we are dealing with Time, there is no such thing as fractional reversal. Time is either Time past or future. Plus-time and minus-time are thinkable, but $\sqrt{-1}$ time is not. If, therefore, $\sqrt{-1}$ is to have a field of significance, it must be with reference to quantities which admit of conception under other than two antithetical aspects. Hence its *geometrical* interpretation; for in geometrical magnitude we have variety which is not limited to antithesis. Retaining then the definitions of $+$ and $-$ as symbols which respectively preserve and invert, $\sqrt{-1}$ may be defined to semi-invert the linear magnitude before whose representative symbol it is written. Or, generalizing still further, $\sqrt{-1}$ will have meaning in all investigations of quantity which implies direction, such as force, velocity, etc.; that is, of *vector* quantities, which can be represented in magnitude and direction by directed right lines.

The geometrical interpretation of the symbol $\sqrt{-1}$ converted Single into Double Algebra, and extended the field of operation from the line to the plane. This extension Hamilton (W. R.) carried one step farther into tri-dimensional space, by the Quaternion Calculus. But this step was very different in its nature from the last. Unlike the above, it was long distinctly before the mind as a desideratum, and the problem was not what to do, but how to do it. Enormously complex formulæ resulted from the attempt to effect this extension by means of the existing notation. Before, the obstacle to advance was the unintelligibility of certain combinations of symbols; it was now the lack of all adequate symbols whatever. In the one case the symbols had outrun the thought, in the other the thought for a long time outran the symbols. When the extension was made, however, limitations were again imposed. For the Quaternion Calculus destroyed the uni-

¹ *Trigonometry and Double Algebra*, p. 42.

versality of the commutative law in multiplication, so that a product cannot be written indifferently rq or qr . In the algebra of pure space, an apparently final limit to further extension seems to have been reached in Quaternions, and it is for some its reproach that it refuses to recognize the fourth dimension which for a time haunted the mind of its inventor,¹ and is preëminently the science of a space of three dimensions.

The resistance which attended the above development constitutes one of its most curious features. The successive breaking down of barriers, although they were arbitrarily imposed, was at the time seriously felt to be subversive and to involve a contradiction in fact, as well as in terms. Multiplication by a fraction, for example, is now so thoroughly understood that we can scarcely realize how it should ever have occasioned any difficulty. Yet this difficulty can be readily reproduced. We have but to restrict the process of multiplication to whole numbers for the beginner, to cause him inevitably to regard it as (what it then really is) simply a short method of equal additions, the invariable effect of which is to increase the multiplicand. When, therefore, a process is called multiplication which renders the multiplicand less, we can sympathize with Recorde's scholar, who felt not only the inconsistency of designating so radically different a process by the same name, but could not see how multiplying a number by another could possibly make it smaller. Professor Kelland, who cites this illustration of the difficulty which attends the extension of definitions from Recorde's Whetstone of Witte (1558), remarks further that Euclid, "who dared not venture on fractions," could, "in his logical and unbending march, never have attained to this new view of the process of multiplication which crept in by the advance from whole numbers to fractions."²

So, again, of isolated positive and negative monomials. The transitional steps from arithmetic to algebra can now be so clearly indicated that we are surprised at the fog which first attended them, and wonder that the demolition of the barriers erected about the science of pure number should ever have troubled any one's sense of security. These simple steps appear to us as did some of Euclid's propositions to the commentators mentioned by Proclus, who affirmed that the very asses would admit them without demonstration. If, however, we recur to the writings of the transitional period, when words to which long usage had at-

¹ *Lectures on Quaternions*, Preface, p. 60, *et seq.*

² *Introduction to Quaternions*, Preface.

tached definite meanings were suddenly put to new uses, and, on the other hand, new ideas seemed contradictory and meaningless, as couched in the old terminology, we can understand the distrust occasioned by those who so flippantly subtracted twelve from two and manipulated quantities which they affirmed to be less than nothing. How, says d'Alembert, can $1:-1:: -1:1$, which is true, be true if the negative quantity is less than zero? (How, indeed, if quantity is not so defined as to include these negative "quantities," and we do not know what "less than zero" means! When Hamilton writes $k^5 = k$, we must first know what Hamilton means.) For, being less than zero, he continues, it is less than one, and we then have the absurdity that the means of a proportion can both be less than the extremes. Leibnitz denied that -1 could be a mean proportional at all, maintaining the curious distinction that while a negative number could enter into our calculations, it could not enter as a term in our ratios; exactly as $\sqrt{-1}$ was subsequently admitted into operations, which, however, led to nothing except as it was eliminated before their completion. (Writers in other sign-languages than that of Mathematics, some of whom objected to the use of unreaals and imaginaries before the mist which enshrouded them was cleared away, would do well to remember and follow this *sine qua non* of mathematical reasoning on such symbols; namely, their complete elimination before the conclusion is reached, or that what was an assumption in the premiss should be no more in the result.) Carnot, commenting on the above proportion, argued that if -1 was less than nothing, it was of course less than one, and therefore the second term was less than the first; and since the fourth must be less than the third, -1 would be at one and the same time both greater and less than unity. Names, especially in scientific classifications, often shadow forth the thought lying back of the word; and those words, *unreal*, for a long time applied to the negative roots of equations, and *imaginary*, subsequently applied to the square roots of such quantities, sufficiently indicate the point of view from which they were regarded. During the periods of actual extension, the very foundations of the science seemed to be called in question.

In some of the cases above mentioned, where the extension of meaning involves so great a change in the nature of the operations and the interpretation of the results, it might seem desirable to adopt a new nomenclature. It is certain that the employment of the same word for the denotation of distinct things has produced great confusion. On the other hand, the growth in the meaning

of words has contributed to the brevity and generality of the language as a growth in their number could never have done. A principle of permanence is, moreover, observed, whereby quantities, as they degrade, do not fall out of the categories in which they are classed, and general rules of operation are so stated as to include the various kinds of quantities.

It would not seem possible, at first thought, that difficulties of interpretation should grow out of the combination of symbols of which the meanings are well-defined and mutually consistent when not in combination. For the laws which govern these combinations are framed directly upon the meanings of the symbols combined. Yet this is precisely the way in which the difficulties above cited arose. They did not originate with adventurous or captious spirits who get themselves or others into trouble through the love of it. They *presented themselves*, as it were, in the course of a legitimate use of symbols previously defined. The barriers were encountered because, under a natural law of progress, they stood in the way. And mathematics is not the only science in which conceptions have been called in question because they ventured to grow. The fact is, the symbols were capable of more meaning than was first assigned to them, and the contradictions disappeared when this lack was supplied. Only that which was put into them could be extracted from them, but they could consistently contain more. Furthermore, while in its origin every symbolic calculus is purely arbitrary, when it encounters such obstacles in the course of its development the direction of subsequent growth is no longer an arbitrary one. It is predetermined; first, by the assumptions already made, unless indeed they be entirely abandoned and an altogether new calculus framed; or secondly, by certain properties of the magnitudes with which it deals, properties which often enter disguisedly into the statement of problems, although left out of the meanings arbitrarily given to the symbols. Suppose, for example, the following problem of *Literal Arithmetic*: A boy was one half as old as his mother a years ago; now he is one half as old as his father. How much older is his father than his mother? Now the conditions of the problem are explicit, but they involve a doubtful element, for the mother may be older than the father, and in that case the result will involve an impossible subtraction. Intensive quantity has crept into the statement, but is not represented by the symbols. We have in fact two hypotheses, on either of which the symbolic statement may be expressed. If we choose the wrong one, the result

will indicate an impossible operation, and to obtain the right result we must recur to the original statement and change the hypothesis. But this change is made only in virtue of the intensive property of duration. To say "how much younger" instead of "how much older," taken in connection with the change in sign which this change in statement produces in the result, is to interpret negative quantity. This interpretation, therefore, is not arbitrary, for no meaning can be assigned if the conditions of the problem do not admit of a change in the intensive mode. If there is no choice of hypothesis in this respect, and the conditions cannot be regarded from any other point of view than that first taken, there is no possible interpretation, and the conditions really involve an impossibility of which the result is the indication. The new definition of the symbol $+a$ is therefore constrained by the nature of that which it represents, and this definition enables us to remove at once all ambiguity from the results, without being under the necessity of making provisional hypotheses and going back to change them if our choice happened to be a wrong one. It is, in other words, a generalization by means of which both cases are provided for in one general statement, process, and result.

Like conditions controlled the extension of meaning which gave significance to the imaginary $\sqrt{-1}$. The growth of a symbolic calculus is not a purely arbitrary synthesis. $\sqrt{-1}$ does not admit of any arbitrary interpretation. Like a compound word, its parts hint the nature and limit the range of its significance. The meaning already vested in the minus sign foreshadows its *versor* character, the conventions already adopted limit the amount of version, and the nature of quantity restricts its field of operation. Its explanation is therefore neither assumptive nor absolute, but consequential and limited. The extension takes place in the direction of geometry, because elsewhere quantity does not offer the requisite variety, and new conceptions of quantity are not likely to be called into existence by the necessities of transcendental formulæ. The growth of the science shows a continual addition to the meaning of symbols, but none to our knowledge of either number or quantity. The mathematical treatment of continuous quantity is a comparatively recent one, but its formulæ did not suggest the idea of continuity. Aristotle defined it, and Euclid admitted it in his postulates. The intensive nature of quantity was not suggested by the plus and minus signs, although they did lead, if not oblige, us to take it into account. The conception of two dimensions was not acquired by the interpretation of $\sqrt{-1}$, nor that of three di-

mensions by Hamilton's *ε*. The progress made consists only in the perfecting of the symbolic form of expression or in the creation of what Hamilton called his calculus, a new *organ of expression*, and so is but the better adaptation and adjustment of language to those conceptions of quantity and space which are derived from the universal consciousness.

The analogies between the growth of mathematics and that of other sciences are striking. It is peculiar to human methods that wherever we extend a boundary we also fix a limit. New conceptions and syntheses are also new limitations. Wherever we conquer a province from those outlying spaces of darkness which in every sphere of inquiry baffle our efforts to see and to know, we forthwith intrench and wall it about with a barrier which must be destroyed by those who come after us before they can see beyond it. The record of human history is the record of the overthrow of these limitations which great men, in their very greatness, impose upon their fellows, which nations and races have imposed upon humanity, and which humanity seeks often to impose upon God. These barriers mathematics encounters in the inner world of mental activity, — barriers which arise now from its own arbitrary conventions, now from the finite powers of the human mind. In passing them, it also, for a time, seems to waive its pretensions to clear statement and logical consistency, to start anew with generalized concepts and processes in a wider and more fruitful field of activity. The observation of external nature, which furnishes mathematics, regarded as a tool, with the material which it interprets, is paralleled by like processes of observation, induction, even experiment, in the inner world of thought where the tool itself is whetted for service. And this to an extent which few realize.¹ The purely deductive method which characterizes its applications does not preside over its growth. The prediction of Neptune, or Hamilton's anticipation of experiment in conical refraction, belong to these its applications as an instrument of research, and as such its value cannot be over-estimated. Physics writes over its door the inscription of Plato, and with a meaning far beyond his thought for whom the conic sections were but intellectual playthings, the modern physicist, who recognizes them as the pathways of suns and atoms, repeats the words *Divinity geometrizes*. But, besides the world of natural phenomena where the tool is an instrument of research, is another where the weapon is forged;

¹ See Address of Professor Sylvester before the Mathematical and Physical Section of the British Association, Exeter, 1869. *Nature*, vol. i., pp. 237, 261.

where induction, analogy, imagination, invention play their part in the development of the science itself, — a science which Gauss named the Science of the Eye.

The resistance which attends progress in other departments has its parallel also in the struggle which accompanies that of mathematics. Here also unrecognized factors are continually modifying systems in which they had no place. The struggle is not so intense, but it is none the less real. So far from being an endless chain tied to a few fundamental conceptions, its subject-matter and symbolic form are undergoing constant change. The difficulty of keeping pace with its ever-increasing abstractions is chiefly an intellectual one, and it thus escapes the resistance which springs from the heart. Primitive thought, however vague and indefinite, is full of concrete images which appeal to the imagination and evoke the affections. Humanity at large parts regretfully and painfully with its toys. Who can follow the history of religious symbols, from the rude objects of worship in fetichism through all the imagery of animal and human forms to the highest planes of religious development, where the divorce between the concrete and the abstract is most completely effected, without sympathizing with those who at the critical periods resented the fall of Baal? without realizing the difficulty of keeping pace with that abstract contemplation which soars beyond the reach or need of earthly symbols? without understanding why, in the temple which to-day is filled only with a Presence, or contains at most only an altar from which the statue of the god has forever disappeared, the Person rather than the Principle is still the dominant source of power and of peace? In this same difficult and high path of abstraction the science of mathematics marches. The beginner encounters at the very outset the peculiar difficulties which are inherent in abstract symbols. In trigonometry he puts away his lines for ratios with an effort, and, further on, that hitherto most real thing *force* eludes his grasp as it turns out to be only a time-rate of momentum generation. Here, too, symbols become identified with that which is symbolized, and the modification of one seems to threaten the other. Here, too, structures which are provisional come to be regarded as permanent, new factors are unwelcome visitors, reconstruction seems destruction, and men who have themselves contributed to progress obey at last the law of intellectual inertia and declare for absolute rest. And, as already remarked, while the subject-matter does not so closely touch the hearts and interests of men, the difficulties of apprehension constitute a resistance quite as real. For leadership

is always isolated, and the forces of progress work always against the inertia of the masses.

To his essay on History, Emerson prefixes the following lines:—

“I am the owner of the sphere,
Of the seven stars and the solar year,
Of Cæsar’s hand, and Plato’s brain,
Of Lord Christ’s heart, and Shakespeare’s strain.”

Amid the wreck of the material world, this stanza is like the inspiring blast of a bugle. No alienation of our mental estate. We are all eldest sons in the line of succession. Men, cities, nations, rise, culminate, and disappear. But no destruction, however complete, includes thoughts with things. The products of mind survive the work of the hand. Rubbish of a middle age may hide them, a whirlwind of fanaticism may sweep them out of sight, but the renaissance is sure, and the hand of the Arab who sets the torch to the library transmits the seed-corn to posterity. But Emerson declares also for the duality of the truth,—though he does not trouble himself with the task of reconciliation,—and we are conscious that much of our heritage is of very obsolete worth. That, however important as a stepping stone, however valuable now as completing a record, it contains much that is only an object of curiosity, and which, but for its correlations with the before and the after, would provoke only a smile. Many a thought is there, once a reality, but which has proved only a fiction, and, like the crystal spheres of the old astronomy, belongs to-day only to poetry: many a mental structure in which mind once dwelt and rested now claiming only the interest of ruins. All advances are characterized by this negative, destructive process, which calls out both regret and protest. Under the extension of education, whereby more men to-day think and investigate than ever before, whereby idiosyncracies of belief and points of view are multiplied, this instability becomes terrifying, for it is ever in the front, while reconstruction lags behind. All the old edifices seem honey-combed by these new workers who swarm in every department of inquiry, scrutinizing, comparing, questioning, till the whole body of knowledge appears only a flux, and the soul, like the dove, if it leaves its ark, looks out over an infinite ocean, and sees no resting-place.

But as the clouds lift and the smoke of conflict clears away, as the passions which these questions touch subside, has it not been, and therefore will it not always be found, as in the case of that science which happily is free from the influence of hopes and fears,

that not only have new horizons been opened, but that the new includes all the old, nothing has been lost in the fray, and only the limitations have perished.

A. S. Hardy.

ARNOLD OF RUGBY AND THE OXFORD MOVEMENT.

In his trenchant address at Liverpool, with its ringing changes on *lucidity*, now more than a year ago, Mr. Matthew Arnold said that he supposed many of his hearers had been reading the account of the Oxford movement in the lively volumes of "that acute but not always good-natured rattle," Mr. Mozley. This movement was full of interest. It had produced men to be respected, men to be admired, men to be loved, men of goodness, learning, genius, and charm. But could they resist the truth, asked Mr. Arnold, that *lucidity* would have been fatal to it? "The movers of all those questions about apostolic succession, patristic authority, primitive usage, postures, vestments, — questions so passionately debated, and on which he would not seek to cast ridicule, — did they not all begin by taking for granted something no longer possible or receivable, build on this basis as if it were indubitably solid, and fail to see that, their basis not being solid, all they built upon it was fantastic?"

This very polite and positive bowing out of the High Churchmen is the more interesting when we remember Mr. Arnold's pedigree, and that Arnold of Rugby was the stoutest opposer of the Oxford Movement at its birth, and the founder of that party in the Church of England which has alone, in the Church, been able to oppose the movement with anything philosophic, worthy, or attractive, from that time to this. There was no man whom Newman and his followers found so directly athwart their course at every point, none whose words were constantly so ringing and emphatic against them, none whose successes they so much feared and dreaded. And it is interesting to note, in these echoes of the bitter conflict, in Mr. Mozley's *Reminiscences*, how, if the "rattle" may ever, indeed, be said to be bad-natured, it is chiefly so, so far as the really prominent men of the time are concerned, in the chapter on Arnold. Really bad-natured it is perhaps a trifle too severe to call Mr. Mozley even here; but he certainly manages to

present about as untrue a picture of Arnold's work and character as it would be possible to present in so few pages. What the several proportions of malice prepense and mere obtuseness are, each man who understands Arnold and reads these *Reminiscences* may settle for himself. Our own impression of Mr. Mozley's habitual honesty and good nature is such that we regard his depreciations as, for the most part, only another evidence of the powerlessness of the Tractarian mind to understand so large a man as Arnold.

To Arnold's "intense energy of character, his deep sense of a calling which he had to obey, and of a work which he had to do," it was impossible that Mr. Mozley should not bear witness, if he was to write of Arnold at all. But so far as Newman and his colleagues were concerned, he declares that all the time that Arnold was expressing himself about them "with his constitutional warmth and decision," he was "ignorant, and worse than ignorant, of their character and their cause." "Better had he never heard of them," Mr. Mozley goes so far as to say, "than acquired so ridiculous a misconception." "What else, however," he asks, "could be expected from a man who in 1832 published in successive pamphlets his full belief that the House of Commons could easily and quickly so modify the Prayer-Book that all English churches, sects, and denominations would be found shaking hands in the closest brotherhood and accord before the end of ten years?"

Better had Mr. Mozley never heard of Arnold's pamphlets on Church Reform, we are tempted to retort to this, than acquired so ridiculous a misconception. What sort of justice this does to one of the profoundest discussions of the relations of Church and State which has ever been written, and to the only scheme upon which any long life is possible to the English Establishment in particular, every reader of Arnold's pamphlets, or of the analysis of them which Dean Stanley gives in his memoir, will quickly determine. It is certainly an unpromising enough beginning for any very intelligent chapter upon Arnold.

But Arnold was not simply ignorant of the character and cause of the Oxford men. He was also, according to Mr. Mozley, "a disappointed man," chagrined because his pamphlets did not get a better reception. He was bothered and nettled, in particular, by a Tory clergyman, one Litchfield, who used to satirize him in the Rugby neighborhood, and fell into the nervous fear that he was living in a jungle, with a Litchfield behind each rustling reed; and, having, "like many other good and great people," "a temper

of his own, and rather a warm one," he wreaked his disappointment upon the High Churchmen, — and hence his Edinburgh Review article upon the "Oxford Malignants," in the Hampden controversy. Newman's friends, we are told, were astonished beyond measure when Arnold's friends proclaimed with confidence and pride that he was the writer of the article. They had accepted the character of Arnold as an "amiable enthusiast, drawn in by Bunsen;" but it was certainly not in the character of the "amiable enthusiast" that he appeared in this article. Strangely enough, the only indignation which the garrulous High Churchman seems able to see in the article, even at this writing, is "the indignation of a man disappointed of a mighty ambition." "Which was the true Arnold," he asks, "the writer of the pamphlets and of the sermons, or the writer of the article? Was it the dove assuming for the hour the sombre plumage and shrill screams of the hawk, or the bird of prey that, as often as it found convenient, could glisten in the sun and coo like a dove?" And the not at all ambiguous *coup* with which he dismisses Arnold, so far as the direct discussion goes, is the observation that "it is too true that very good gentlemen will sometimes denude themselves of their Christian livery when they enter the anonymous arena."

This parting benediction is quite gratuitous and beside the mark. Arnold did not enter the anonymous arena in writing the Hampden article. It is quite true that the articles in the "Edinburgh Review" were published without the writers' names. But there were very few articles of any interest or moment of which the authorship was not well enough known. Dr. Arnold's authorship of the article in question was an open secret from the beginning, or rather no secret at all. He wrote about it with the utmost freedom to all his friends, even if he did rebuff Lord Howe for his meddling in the matter, and certainly he did not presume upon any screen of anonymousness to "denude himself of his Christian livery" or any other livery that he was in the habit of wearing. There was absolutely nothing in the article, moreover, which he did not repeat in a thousand ways before and afterwards; and he would probably have liked nothing better than the privilege of reading the whole, from the pulpit of the Sheldonian, to the clergy who hurried up from all England to vote condemnation of a book which they had never read. That Newman and his friends should have expected anything different from Arnold, if he spoke at all, and that Mr. Mozley should ask whether the writer of the pamphlets and sermons or the writer of the arti-

cle was the true Arnold, shows what a flimsy synthesis the Oriel estimate of this "amiable enthusiast" was.

But Arnold's article upon the "Oxford Malignants" was not only thoroughly characteristic, if, indeed, as Dean Stanley observes, containing the most vehement and personal language which Arnold ever deliberately used; it was also thoroughly just. What did Arnold charge against Newman and the Convocation? In the first place, and chiefly, he would never have written the article but to say this, that what they were doing in condemning Hampden was "merely lynch law." If Hampden had preached or published heresy, let him be tried by the proper judges, either the Bishop or the Vice-Chancellor, assisted by the six Doctors of Divinity. But what they were doing was merely lynch law; and they might just as well run down any other man who was unpopular with the dominant party in Oxford, and say that they had no confidence in him, and therefore pass a *privilegium* against him without giving him any trial. All of which was strictly true, and there was absolutely nothing else to be said about it by any truthful and decent man in his sober senses. This, moreover, Mr. Mozley himself now practically admits. What does he say? Not only that "any reasonable person may doubt the validity of an act depriving the Professor of privileges appertaining to the very essence of his office," but that it was really an "audacious act." The only excuse which he is able to conjure up for the judgment which was passed on Hampden for a book in which a few alarmists scented something unusual is, that "all England looked to Oxford to protect the orthodox doctrine," and, since there was no time for the members of Convocation to read the book, "there must either be such a trial of it, or none at all." Arnold's own vehement words against the authors and supporters of the act do not charge a greater culpability than is frankly enough confessed by Mr. Mozley, with all his disposition to make the best showing for his friends that is possible. "A great university, the most important theological university in the world, — for Oxford was now the only rival of the Vatican, — pronounced the strongest possible condemnation of a book and of its author, inflicting upon him an injurious and penal deprivation," while "the great mass of the multitude that inflicted this penalty were very, if not entirely, ignorant of the book which was the *corpus delicti*." "The country members of Convocation, as fast as they came up," he says, "implored their resident friends, with pitiable importunity, to tell them all about it, generally in vain, for their resident friends knew

as little about the book as themselves." A pamphlet drawn up by Newman himself in one night, and almost at one sitting, containing such extracts from the lectures as showed their more suspicious features, but often most misleading in their isolation from the context, and altogether inadequate to give an idea of the scope of the work, was briskly circulated; "and this pamphlet," says Mr. Mozley, "became the text of the controversy, to the shame, it must be said, of many who could have turned to the original lectures, and, as self-constituted judges, ought to have done so."

How did this work, which "had to be done first and criticised afterwards," appear afterwards to those who had done it? If Samuel Wilberforce and Mr. Gladstone, whose testimony Mr. Mozley quotes, are to be considered representative, it appeared just as it appeared to Arnold at the time. Both of these men wrote to Hampden, many years afterwards, to apologize for their part in the matter, and to confess that when they voted against the lectures they "in truth knew nothing about them." Mr. Gladstone's letter, Mr. Mozley tells us, was written "in the very abyss of penitence and self-humiliation" for an act which had been, he said, "clearly wrong." And since it was a principle which Bishop Wilberforce urged upon the Oxford students "to entertain no doubt, but stamp it out as they would a spark in a magazine, and recoil from it in horror," it is safe enough to believe that there was nothing very explosive in Hampden's book if he was not disturbed when he did read it, a dozen years after condemning it.

Was Hampden really in the right, and was his cause the cause of truth? Mr. Mozley is right enough in thinking that this is the most important question. Hampden's point was that the scholastic theology had overloaded and corrupted the primitive and true gospel of Christ, making the church of history and to-day a false embodiment of genuine and essential Christianity. And this, of course, is where men divide. Newman and his followers saw in the complex theology and high ecclesiasticism of the mediæval church the very fulfillment of the Christian ideal. Arnold believed Hampden's lectures to be "entirely true in their main points;" and he said, "I should think that the wholesome air of such a man's lectures would tend to freshen men's faith, and assure them that it had a foundation to rest upon, when the infinite dishonesty and foolery of such divinity as I remember in the lecture-rooms and pulpits in times past would be enough to drive a man of sound mind into any extravagances of belief." And however remarkable the development of ecclesiasticism in the Church of England itself, in the

years since 1836, we do not think there is much doubt as to how the world's general thought has been settling this class of questions since Arnold wrote.

Arnold saw hope and reform for the church and religion in going forward; and only in going forward; Newman and Pusey saw them only in going backward — and hence the men must needs clash at every point. Their conceptions of the church's functions and authority, and of the true method of religious inquiry, were diametrically opposed. If it be said that Arnold was ignorant and worse than ignorant of what the Tractarian cause and conceptions were, the only answer is, of course, the reference to what he wrote about them — and he was pretty busy in writing about them for ten years; and we venture to assert that, so far from misconceiving the aim and drift of the movement, he was precisely the one man in the Church of England who did understand the movement truly, and whose discussions of it, leaving alone side-issues of small moment, go directly to what the whole development of the movement has proved to be its distinctive and essential features. Arnold would have been the quickest to admit all the attractive personal elements in Newman and the other men of Mr. Mozley's book; he would have had no quarrel in the world with them over Clapham evangelicalism or Gregorian chants; he would have commended Mr. Mozley's interest in Gothic architecture and catenary curves as harmless and altogether civilizing, and have rejoiced with all his heart at the superiority of the churches built by Gilbert Scott to those of fifty years ago; and he was far too much of a historian and antiquary himself to have any feelings but kind ones for the "Library of the Fathers" and for all the really important work done by the Oxford men toward awakening a deeper historical consciousness in the church. But were Newman's personal magnetism, the Gothic Revival, or an interest in Justin Martyr the characteristic and really significant things in the Tractarian movement? The significant thing was its revival of the baneful and decaying sacramentarian idea of the clergy and the church; and time will make it quite clear, and has already made it quite clear, that Arnold was right in understanding the movement to mean just this and in directing his discussions of it to nothing else.

Almost the only subject insisted upon in the first two volumes of the "Tracts for the Times" was the importance of "the Apostolical Succession" of the clergy, and the consequent exclusive claims of the Church of England to be regarded as the only true church in England, if not in the world. In other words, as says Dean

Stanley, "the one doctrine which was then put forward as the cure for the moral and social evils of the country, which Arnold felt so keenly, was the one point in their system which he always regarded as morally powerless and intellectually indefensible, as incompatible with all sound notions of law and government, and as tending above all things to substitute a ceremonial for a spiritual Christianity." This "heraldic or succession view of the question" Arnold could "hardly treat gravely; there is something so monstrously profane," he said, "in making our heavenly inheritance like an earthly estate to which our pedigree is our title. And really what is called succession is exactly a pedigree and nothing better; like natural descent, it conveys no moral nobleness, — nay, far less than natural descent, for I am a believer in some transmitted virtue in a good breed, but the succession notoriously conveys none." The Popish and Oxford view is that "the church (that is, in their sense, the clergy) is a sort of chartered corporation, and that by being attached to this corporation any given individual acquires such and such privileges;" whereas Arnold maintained that "a man's relation to any church is quite a thing subordinate and secondary, although, where the church is what it should be, it is so great a means of grace that its benefits are of the highest value." "We were not to derive our salvation," he said, "through or from the church, but to be kept or strengthened in the way of salvation by the aid and example of our fellow Christians, who were to be formed into societies for this very reason, that they might help one another, and not leave each man to fight his own fight alone." A man's salvation was something that lay between himself and God; and his belonging to this or that church "had no more to do with the matter than his being born in France or in England, in Westmoreland or in Warwickshire."

This, of course, struck at the very foundation of the High Church system. A good man was not safe, Keble and Newman said, unless he belonged to an episcopal church; Arnold retorted that this was equally unchristian with saying that to belong to a true church would save a bad man. He was very far from doubting the expediency of episcopacy in the Church of England; but "to insist on the necessity of episcopacy," he said, "is exactly like insisting on the necessity of circumcision. Both are and were lawful, but to insist on either as *necessary* is unchristian, and binding the church with a yoke of carnal ordinances; and the reason why circumcision, although expressly commanded once, was declared not binding upon Christians is much stronger against the binding

nature of episcopacy, which never was commanded at all; the reason being that all forms of government and ritual are in the Christian Church indifferent and to be decided by the church itself, *pro temporum et locorum ratione*, 'the church' not being the clergy, but the congregation of Christians." The unity at which the Anglo-Catholics were aiming, and which has always been "the idol of Judaizers," was a formal, worthless, and impracticable thing. "The true and most precious unity has never been lost, but in all times and in all countries there has been a succession of men, enjoying the blessings and showing forth the fruits of Christ's spirit, in their lives and in what is truly their religion."

Mr. Mozley drolly observes that "as Arnold's own turn was to speculation and skepticism, he had but scant practical aim." If the case for his "skepticism" depended simply upon the case for his "scant practical aim," it would certainly be a very poor case. It would be hard to think of a man in whom the theoretical and the practical were more immediately joined together than in Arnold, or one whose speculations were more immediately suggested by and directed against practical evils and abuses. Whatever province he touched — society, education, politics, or the church — it was with the hand of the practical reformer, and his hand was immediately felt. There were very few fresh and open minds which came under his influence which he did not also send away inspired with the spirit of practical reform. It was chiefly the practical element in his mind which made him so impatient with the Tractarians, which prompted his most fiery utterances against them, and made him so quick to see the *reductio ad absurdum* of many of their positions. "These men would exclude John Bunyan and Mrs. Fry and John Howard from Christ's church, while they exalt the Non-jurors into confessors and Laud into a martyr." "There is something almost ludicrous in the way in which — speaks of Calvin and some of the great living writers of Germany as of men laboring under a judicial blindness. It is vain to argue with such men; only when they ascribe a judicial blindness to Calvin and Zwingle or to Tholuck and Bunsen, one cannot but be reminded of those who 'with lies made the heart of the righteous sad, whom God had not made sad,' or of those who denied St. Paul's apostleship and spirituality, because he was not one of the original twelve apostles, and because he would not preach circumcision." Mr. Mozley, we imagine, would not quarrel with Arnold greatly for saying that he never found a really great man in any of the old English Divines, and that if he had spent his time in reading them, he would have

read a great many very indifferent books; for Mr. Mozley calls them "a wordy race." But the composure of every Tractarian must certainly have been very much disturbed by Arnold's opinion that there was more of Christianity in any one of Mrs. Sherwood's or Mrs. Cameron's tracts than in all the two Oxford octavos.

The priestcraft and succession doctrines, the Oxford view of the sacraments, and all the magnifying of ritual were abhorrent to Arnold. "They are the very errors," he said, "which, in studying moral and religious truth, I have continually had to observe and to eschew." If he spoke vehemently against them, it was only as he spoke vehemently against whatever he counted mischievous; and the Oxford men, and especially the instigators of the attack upon Hampden, were in no wise so conspicuous for "dove-like sweetness and simplicity" that they, of all men, may safely hasten to prefer the charge of being a "hawk" against any theological controversialist. Vehement Arnold certainly was. He did not hesitate to say that he regarded the movement, in its general and inevitable tendencies, as a mere aggravation of the worst superstitions of the Roman Catholics, while stripped of that consistency which stamps even the errors of the Romish system with something of a character of greatness. Whatever of genius, of goodness or attractiveness there might be in Newman or Pusey or Keble or Froude, the movement upon which they were launching the English Church was one which would run into a great system of ritualism and spend itself in miserable and childish quarrels over petty forms and externalities. There had been fanaticisms born of great and noble ideas and working to great and noble ends; but this was to be a fanaticism for "a dress, a ritual, a name, a ceremony, a technical phraseology, — the superstition of a priesthood without its power, — objects so pitiful that, if gained ever so completely, they would make no man the wiser or the better; they would lead to no good, intellectual, moral, or spiritual."

Emerson speaks somewhere of the fatal certainty of names; and the fact that the name which has come to indicate most clearly to most men the distinctive thing in the Oxford system — has become indeed the well-nigh universal name for the system — is *Ritualism*, is one strong witness certainly to Arnold's just insight.

We believe that Arnold saw the movement in its true proportions and was altogether right. No man would deny, none certainly can do it rightfully, that the movement which began at Oxford has been the means of purging the English Church of much dead and cumbrous material, that it has stirred the church to new life

and useful activity in a hundred directions, that it has stimulated useful and neglected studies, that it numbers to-day among its clerical adherents a far greater number of men of both intellectual and moral force than belong to the old Low Church party. But more rapid far than the development of any salutary practical forces in the movement has been the development of a ritualism and sacramentarianism as minute and imperious as those of Rome itself, strengthening every deadening superstition and turning men back into children; while as a scheme of religious thought it has been simply reactionary, has set itself against the sure results and inevitable tendencies of modern science, and made it necessary for a great section of the English Church to travel a hard road twice.

All this Arnold clearly foresaw, and he fought the movement fearlessly from the beginning. If he lacked insight, as Mr. Mozley charges, he certainly never lacked courage. The thought of his chronic shivering in fear of satirical Tory parsons in the jungle is merely laughable to any serious student of his life and books. Such a thought could find permanent lodgment only with men of the Boswellian stamp, like Mr. Mozley, with whom personalities play so paramount a part, and who, incapable themselves of a broad outlook like Arnold's, imagine that satirical Tory parsons must needs be as troublesome as they try to be, or as troublesome to large men like Arnold as they would be to middle-sized men like themselves. Mr. Mozley observes in another place, with the utmost apparent seriousness, that a single word dropped by Newman at Rome, which chanced to reach Arnold at Rugby, fell on him with the weight of a papal excommunication — taken off some years afterwards, he is kind enough to assure us. This was in 1832. The terror of the new popes was evidently somewhat dispelled four years afterwards, for in 1836 we find Arnold writing a word to Whately, which we would seriously commend to Mr. Mozley's attention. "I never yet in my life," he says, "made any application for preferment, nor have I desired it. But I confess, if Hampden is made a Bishop, I wish that they would put me in his place at Oxford. I think under present circumstances that I could do more good at Oxford than at Rugby. I could not supply your place, but I could supply it better than it is supplied now. I should be of weight from my classical knowledge, and I am old enough now to set down many of the men who are foremost in spreading their mischief, and to give some sanction of authority to those who think as I do, but who at present want a man to lean upon. And though the Judaizers hate me, I believe, worse

than they hate Hampden, yet they could not get up the same clamor against me, for the bugbear of apostolical succession would not do. Furthermore, my spirit of pugnaciousness would rejoice in fighting out the battle with the Judaizers, as it were in a saw-pit; and, as my skin is tough, my wife's tougher, and the children's toughest of all, I am satisfied that we should live in Oxford amidst any quantity of abuse unhurt in health or spirits." To one an ocean away from Oxford it is hard to detect in this the tone of the paralysis of "excommunication" or the ague of terror. Indeed, we have wasted quite too much space over the imputation of lack of courage in Arnold. If there was ever a man who never feared the face or word of another, it was he; least of all could he be upset by the mock thunderbolts of this new Vatican.

But it was not simply with the *priestcraft* of the Oxford men that Arnold came in collision. It was also with their spirit of resistance, shared indeed by the whole conservative part of the church, but of which they seemed to have a double portion, to the results and methods of modern science, in their application especially to the Bible and religious doctrine. Arnold may almost be called the father of scientific biblical criticism, and of the new doctrine of inspiration in the Church of England; while the temper of the Oxford men is very well indicated by a passage in Mr. Mozley's book. "Arnold's volume of 'Rugby Sermons,'" says Mr. Mozley, "was not received favorably by Newman and his friends, not so much on account of the sermons themselves as on account of a note on Genesis xxii., in which Arnold laid down that the Almighty could not do an immoral thing, and that consequently if we thought anything wrong, we were bound to believe that He had not done it. This, of course, struck at every miracle and every extraordinary act for which is claimed a preternatural sanction, if in any respect whatever it does not accord with our most sentimental or our most abstract notions of morality. Rightly or wrongly, the note was fully believed at Oxford to have been written with this comprehensive and destructive design."

The Tractarian measure of destructiveness is of very much the same value as its measure, in Arnold's case, of terror. Arnold, in what he wrote upon inspiration and the Bible, was of course simply striking in upon the course in which all that is thoughtful in the church has followed him. Tractarianism was the apotheosis of the traditional, and to nothing was it more terrible than the modern inquiries concerning the composition and character of the Bible. A questionless credulity—that was what it stood for.

"Stamp out a doubt as a spark in a magazine," Samuel Wilberforce said. Arnold would have every man able to give a reason for the faith that was in him. "It is not scriptural," he wrote to Stanley, "but fanatical, to oppose faith to reason. Faith is properly opposed to sense, and is the listening to the dictates of the higher part of our mind, to which alone God speaks, rather than the lower part of us, to which the world speaks. There is no end to the mischiefs done by that one very common and perfectly unscriptural mistake of opposing faith and reason, or whatever you choose to call the highest part of man's nature. This you will find the Scripture never does; and observing this cuts down at once all Pusey's nonsense about Rationalism. What he abuses as Rationalism is just what the Scripture commends as knowledge, judgment, understanding, and the like; that is, the moral reason acting under God, and using, so to speak, the telescope of faith for objects too distant for its naked eye to discover. And to this is opposed, in scriptural language, folly and idolatry and blindness, and other such terms of reproof. According to Pusey, the forty-fourth chapter of Isaiah is Rationalism, and the man who bowed down to the stock of a tree was a humble man, who did not inquire, but believe. But if Isaiah be right, and speaks the words of God, then Pusey, and the man who bowed down to the stock of a tree, should learn that God is not served by folly."

But nowhere do the careful rationalism of Arnold and the blind traditionalism of the Oxford High Churchmen come into more striking contrast than in the personal relations of Arnold and Keble. Of all the leaders of the Oxford movement, it was Keble whom Arnold knew the best. Newman was elected into the very Fellowship at Oriel which Arnold vacated; but Arnold had no personal acquaintance with him until he came up to Oxford as Professor of History, five years after the Hampden controversy, when he was thrown into his company at Oriel, and they became good friends, and so parted. But Keble was Arnold's intimate friend from the beginning of Arnold's student life at Oxford, and tenderly loved by him to his life's end, despite the long coldness on Keble's part, arising from their radical disagreement on points so vital. Keble was his confidant and counselor during the days of doubt and struggle which preceded his ordination. What sort of counselor he was we learn from a letter of his to Justice Coleridge, which Dean Stanley has preserved in his "Life of Arnold." "I have not talked with Arnold lately," he wrote, "on the distressing thoughts which he wrote to you about, but I am fearful,

from his manner at times, that he has by no means got rid of them, though I feel quite confident that all will be well in the end. The subject of them is that most awful one, on which all *very* inquisitive, reasoning minds are, I believe, most liable to such temptations — I mean the doctrine of the blessed Trinity. Do not start, my dear Coleridge; I do not believe that Arnold has any serious scruples of the *understanding* about it, but it is a defect of his mind that he cannot get rid of a certain feeling of objection — and particularly when, as he fancies, the bias is so strong upon him to decide one way from interest; he scruples doing what I advise him, which is to put down the objections by main force whenever they arise in his mind, fearful that in so doing he shall be violating his conscience for a maintenance' sake. I am still inclined to think with you that the wisest thing he could do would be to take a young pupil and a curacy somewhere or other, and cure himself, not by physic, that is, reading and controversy, but by diet and regimen, that is, holy living."

This bald confession certainly sets the author of the "Christian Year" before us in a most extraordinary light. But who shall say that it was not prophetic of the spirit of the whole Oxford movement? Arnold is openly advised to put down his doubts "by main force," whenever they rise, and to be ordained in the midst of them, professing to believe what he does not, and trusting that, in the busy work of the ministry thus entered on, the doubts will somehow or other be forgotten or outgrown. And this Keble calls "holy living"! What would Arnold have called it in 1836? What value would he have set upon a faith thus obtained or thus maintained, at the cost of honor and uprightness? Yet we gather from Mr. Mozley's book that this sort of drugging was not rare among the clergy of the English Church at the time. Mr. Mozley tells us that he argued with a troubled friend of his own in very much the same manner that Keble argued with Arnold. "My general argument was," he says, "that we were bound to accept the teaching of the church, and that in so doing we were in no danger of guiltiness. But while I talked in this strain," he frankly adds, "I was fixing a deep disquiet in my own mind, which remained, and indeed still remains." As indeed it should; for the whole method is surely no less profane — indeed, far more so — than the procedure of the shallow and optimistic religionists of the *Aufklärung*, to whom conviction of sin is all one with the hay fever, and who can only direct the troubled soul to the Grand Manan. It is not by stifling doubts or going around them that

men ought to find peace and strength, or that they ever can do it, but only by going through the doubts, trustfully and with open eyes, to a faith fixed firm in clear convictions, whatever its final content.

As for Keble, it is doubtful whether he ever got beyond this melancholy standpoint to the end of his days. With all that was beautiful and saintly in Keble's character, he was, in very much, most limited and unattractive. Mr. Mozley himself — a most partial witness — tells us that there was no getting on with Keble without entire agreement and submission. He very soon lost his temper in discussion, and raised the pettiest matters into tests of loyalty and orthodoxy. His sympathies were most one-sided. He was smothered in the embrace of a narrow-minded section of the aristocracy, and his whole thought was untrue to the actual state of things in the world. His attitude towards the scientific spirit of the time may be inferred from Mr. Mozley's story of how he once had an argument with Buckland on a coach-top, all the way from Oxford to Winchester, in which he finally took his stand on the conceivability and indeed certainty of the Almighty having created all the fossils and other apparent outcomes of former existences in the six days of Creation. Rather an appalling lack of *lucidity* here, very truly! Mr. Mozley charitably urges that it must have been at the end of the journey, and only when he was hard pressed, that Keble would have delivered a *dictum* like this — and we sincerely hope so; but if this be indeed an exaggeration, it is only an exaggeration of his habitual manner of viewing the relation of the Bible and tradition to religious and scientific truth. In the eyes of the Oxford men it was fatal to doubt; and if fatal to doubt, then, to use Mr. Mozley's words, "superfluous and indeed very foolish to inquire."

Keble is undoubtedly to be looked upon as the flower of the Oxford movement — for in Newman the movement moved beyond itself. Keble's theology, Keble's churchmanship, Keble's rectory and life and character, and the whole constitution of his mind, are the precise fulfillment of the Tractarian ideal. The intimate relation between his thought and character is striking. The character is certainly one of rare beauties; and let the thought have credit for all it can do. In that crowded and exciting time we think of no other whose life was so completely a mirror of his doctrine, and whose doctrine was so completely a mirror of his life, save only Arnold. And Arnold's life, no less pure and spiritual and fragrant than Keble's, was a life infinitely truer to the

actual state of things in the world, infinitely richer in practical aims, infinitely fuller of the heroic and inspiring, a life great in its faithfulness to the present and with the promise of the future. If the opposing tendencies in religious thought were to have their fate settled by the character of the two representatives, there is little doubt, we think, as to which has the more virtue in it, and the greater fitness for the work of the world.

"In the whole mass of the Tractarian literature," says Mr. Mozley, with his characteristic, blunt honesty, — for blunt honesty is his characteristic, however he sometimes strays, — "there is very little biblical criticism — none, it has been said, besides Pusey's 'Minor Prophets' and Keble's metrical version of the Psalms — or social philosophy; no original views of duty, and not much to meet the great problems of the age, though a good deal to impede their solution." In contrast with this, we remember another passage. It is where Mr. Mozley is speaking of the hundreds of Arnold's "oracular utterances," chiefly upon political or social subjects, which were current at Oxford. They might be only what everybody knew or thought, but Arnold had made them his own by his vigor and terseness of expression. "What I remember most," says Mr. Mozley, "is a prophecy that labor and capital would before long be in collision, and that the struggle would be severe and the issue doubtful. Having myself lived some years in a manufacturing town, I was sufficiently aware of the collision and the struggle, but what I seemed to learn from Arnold was that labor would meet with unexpected reinforcement from the philosopher, the philanthropist, and the statesman." It will not, we hope, be thought too presumptuous in us to say, what conviction compels us to say, that, if Mr. Mozley had steadily sought to possess himself of what it was that Arnold was thinking about, in this alone we believe he would have gained more practical and valuable wisdom than the whole series of "Tracts for the Times" could impart, or all the discussions of Oriel common-room upon the Priesthood, the Succession, and the Real Presence, the Sarum usage, and the catenary curve.

Edwin D. Mead.

PROHIBITION IN KANSAS.

THIRTY years ago Kansas was a place to which Indians were sent to get them out of the way of civilization. When the Kansas-Nebraska Bill became a law, May 30, 1854, there were not more than one hundred and fifty white persons within the territory. Nearly seven thousand times one hundred and fifty persons are now here, laying the foundations of the central State of the Union. The area of Kansas is greater than all of New England increased by a second Vermont and two additional Rhode Islands. Within these limits began the conflict with human slavery which was destined to go forward until the nation was forever freed from that curse. John Brown and others wiser than he doomed slavery in Kansas. Then Kansas sent one half of her able-bodied men to help put down the slaveholders' rebellion, and left upon battlefields mortally wounded a larger proportion of her soldiers than any other State in the Union. This youthful State is to-day the leader in another war. First of all the States she has written in her constitution a prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage. Whether this be as wise as her early repudiation of slavery, and whether in this too she anticipates the destiny of the nation, we may leave to the future historian to decide. Even the constitution of Kansas, by its ineffectual prohibition of lotteries, warns us that reforms may fail despite constitutional assertions favorable to them. Yet without presuming to anticipate the verdict of history, and not being over-confident of the effects of a prohibition written in a constitution, we may, for the benefit of all who are discussing means of deliverance from the curse of rum, tell the story of the way that this growing State is taking, and set down the apparent results thus far achieved.

It is only a little more than five years since this question of constitutional prohibition was presented to the people by the action of the governor approving the bill which had passed both houses of the legislature. It is not yet three years since the law made in pursuance of the amendment went into force. Much time was necessarily consumed in test cases brought first to determine whether the amendment had been legally adopted, then to discover how far certain provisions of the law would be sustained by the courts, so that prohibition has not yet had more than two years to test its worth by actual experiment. Add the fact that for more

than a year a man opposed to prohibition has been the governor of the State, and it need not surprise us if the results up to this hour are not the total abolition of the liquor traffic.

Such success as has been attained has been reached through the political parties that exist for other ends than temperance, if for this end also. The temperance people of Kansas have never yet organized in a separate party. There have been one or two futile efforts, but they were such conspicuous failures as to discourage further attempts. In the year 1873 Hon. D. C. Haskell was nominated for governor of the State by a temperance convention which met at Leavenworth; but he at once declined on the ground that the cause of temperance would be hindered by a third party. A similar body nominated John P. St. John in 1876, and he declined for the same reason. The results justify the wisdom of these leaders in temperance reform.

The present position of the State on the liquor question is the outcome of many and persistent efforts for the suppression of intemperance. The most notable of these before the ever-memorable campaign which secured the adoption of prohibition was the so-called "Murphy Movement" of the winter of 1877-78. Thousands signed pledges to abstain from all intoxicating liquors as a beverage. Very many persons thus bound themselves who felt no fear that they would ever become drunkards, but surrendered their own liberty to aid weak brothers. Some towns then closed up their saloons and have kept them closed ever since. Yet in that winter's work little was said about closing the saloons. The chief aim was to induce the drunkard to leave his cups. It was insisted that such liquor laws as existed should be rigidly enforced; but no debate between license and prohibition was even tolerated. The speakers commonly urged that the first thing to do was to unite all temperance men against the use of liquor as a beverage; that the discussion of the best methods of restraining or abolishing the traffic might be left to a later hour.

When the Republican party, which is always victorious in Kansas, held its convention in the fall of 1878 for the nomination of State officers, the delegates came up from districts that had been thoroughly canvassed and deeply moved by temperance orators, yet the question of prohibition was not before that convention and St. John secured its nomination only as a compromise candidate, the great mass of the convention being divided hopelessly between two other candidates. So far was the Republican party from planning a prohibition campaign that St. John was early warned

that his temperance speeches made while he was a candidate for governor would cost him votes. The returns showed that the party was not intensely in love with temperance. St. John was elected, but by a majority much less than that given to the other candidates on the same ticket. Yet in his first message to the legislature he, who has since been named the apostle of prohibition, urged only such a modification of the existing local-option law as should make its provisions applicable to the whole State. Personally he was in favor of prohibition, yet was not willing to risk the loss of all restraint of the liquor traffic in a vain attempt to abolish it. In this the governor fairly reflected the temper of the more thoughtful men among the prohibitionists in the State at that time.

The legislature from which the accidental temperance governor asked local option gave to the people the question of constitutional prohibition. The prohibitory amendment in its present form was written by Hon. N. C. McFarland, now land commissioner at Washington. It was introduced into the senate during the debate on a strong local-option law. The debate extended through the month of February without agreement. At length the opponents of temperance legislation proposed to the temperance men to substitute for the local-option bill, on which they could not agree, the bill for constitutional prohibition. Of course this was done only to dispose of the entire question. The record shows that all senators present voted to submit this question to the people. The history of the hour shows that both sides regarded the movement as a defeat of temperance legislation. It required a call of the house and a night session to get the measure through the legislature. Senators who had voted for it were said to have become alarmed when they feared that it would pass the house, and to have worked energetically to defeat its passage. The governor, who had not recommended this policy, heartily welcomed it; and temperance men throughout the State seized the opportunity so unexpectedly presented to try the temper of the people on this question of prohibition. Even some who doubted the outcome threw themselves earnestly into the debate, lest the failure should in any measure be attributable to their negligence.

Among the many blessings of Kansas must be reckoned her freedom from legislatures every other year. After the adjournment of the legislature of 1879 there were nearly two years in which to discuss the proposed amendment before the people with no fear of hostile legislation in the interval. The time was well

used by both parties. No question was ever more widely or more fully discussed. If there was a single individual in the State who did not hear both sides before the time came to vote, he failed to improve not one chance but a hundred. On this question every man in Kansas had more than a fair chance.

The amendment was carried by a majority of eight thousand. But the reflection of St. John by an increased majority, although he had earnestly advocated the adoption of the amendment, speaking in almost every county of the State and in some places more than once, this is even better evidence than the vote for the amendment that the people willed it. It is also an evidence that the canvass for the constitutional amendment had increased the temperance vote of the State.

The legislature of 1881, chosen in the midst of the discussion of this question, gave us, after careful consideration, a law which has thus far withstood the assaults that the whiskey power has made upon it, and has proved invulnerable at every point. The last legislature refused to change the law, and by an overwhelming majority denied the request of the present governor for a resubmission of the question of constitutional prohibition to the people. The effectiveness of the law may be seen in the fact that seven out of nine of all the cases brought under it in the last two years have resulted in convictions. One wholesale liquor-dealer from another State has paid the costs of a suit to learn that he cannot collect in Kansas for liquor sent here to be sold contrary to the laws of the State. The ground of the decision was that it was an immoral contract and could not be enforced. A county attorney who disregarded the law, neglecting to prosecute notorious offenders in his county, has been ousted from office by an action brought in the Supreme Court of the State, and this, too, by the decision of a jury one half of which were not favorable to the law. Other officials have taken warning. Suits that lingered are pressed to trial, new prosecutions are begun, and saloons are closing in anticipation of the result.

Thus it appears that the public sentiment aroused by the temperance meetings in the winter of 1877-78 gave the needful conditions of success when, by a blunder of the anti-prohibitionists, the question of constitutional prohibition was given to us for settlement. The temperance men, more thoroughly aroused and more numerous than ever before, accepted in earnest the challenge made to them in sport, and by a vigorous campaign, which lasted nearly two years, carried prohibition so overwhelmingly that even the de-

feat of St. John, when nominated for a third term, and the election in his stead of a gentleman who was and is an avowed opponent of the prohibitory policy, has not even apparently checked the progress of the reform. The largest temperance convention that ever met in this State assembled at the capital in January, 1883, when the anti-prohibitionist governor was being inaugurated. The State Temperance Union was then reorganized, and its treasury replenished. This Union is composed of men of all parties, and is the effective instrument of persistent temperance reform. Its able lecturers traverse the State and keep public sentiment active, its treasury aids prosecutions, and its officers see that no legal aid is lacking to the enforcement of the law in any part of the State. The existence and the work of such an organization is an evidence and an assurance that prohibition is not here a mere wave of reform, to advance and recede by turns.

There were 708 open saloons when the law went into operation. There are not now, three years later, more than 220. Last November, reports were collected from sixty-six counties of the State, all the more populous, and it appeared that then there were 313 saloons remaining, more than half of the number being in a single county. Since that report the saloons have been closed in Hays City, Lawrence, Topeka, and, a recent report says, Wyandotte. But this might mean only that the form of sale had changed.

Of course there is a great deal of liquor used as a beverage in the State. No statute, however well enforced, cures depraved appetites. The express companies take packages of liquors to their various offices within the State, and deliver them to any one who presents an order for them. Some individuals send for ten gallons at a time, and sell it in pint bottles under various names. Beer is sold as "Stomach Invigorator Bitters."

Yet there are some indubitable signs that drinking is less common and less reputable than it was a few years ago. When the late Mr. Haskell was nominated for Congress the first time (Fort Scott, 1876), he was visited at his hotel, after retiring, by a drunken crowd of politicians, who insisted upon his rising and drinking with them; and when he refused they poured whiskey over him in a vain effort to force him to swallow it as he was lying in bed. At the convention which nominated his successor this year there was no drunkenness, and there were no men who were inclined to repeat that disgraceful scene. The political conventions, at which a few reckless men were always found to disgrace their associates by their drunken foolishness, are now meetings of

sober men. This fact has been matter of common remark, and is an indication of a notable change in public sentiment on the liquor question. During the recent special session of the legislature I was at the capital, and conversed with legislators from different parts of the State about the enforcement of prohibition in their respective districts. The testimony was uniform — from men who had voted for the amendment and from men who had vigorously opposed it — that the law was well enforced.

Newspapers that ridiculed the policy have first become silent, and then have acknowledged the success of prohibition. A recent notable illustration of this is the "Topeka Commonwealth," one of the ablest and most influential daily papers in the State. Less than one year ago it remained a strong opponent of the prohibitory policy. Two years ago it protested vigorously (but vainly) against putting a prohibition plank in the Republican platform of this State. Yet, in its edition of March 30 it thus speaks: "Public sentiment has undergone a revolution. The prohibitory law has been longer on trial, and it now has friends where two years ago it had opponents. In many localities of Kansas, even in this capital city (a city of 25,000 people), it has been demonstrated that the open public sale of liquors can be prohibited." This is very notable testimony coming from a paper that not only lent no support to the cause of which it declares the success, but even threw the weight of its great influence in favor of the opponents of the cause that it now proclaims triumphant. Perhaps the editor means to give us a hint of his own conversion when later in the same article he says: "A large number, impressed by the results of the enforcement of the law, have accepted the views of the prohibitionists." But this is no singular instance. The press of the State are very largely to-day on the side of prohibition. The exceptions are noticeable from their singularity.

There have been changes in men, also, that are as remarkable as the changes in newspapers. Mr. John A. Martin, of Atchison, is the proprietor of a large daily paper that has long deservedly ranked among the better papers in the State. He has been an opponent of the prohibitory policy. Yet he has recently declared to a newspaper reporter, "I have no idea that prohibition will cut any figure in this year's canvass. We regard it as an accomplished fact in our State, and there is no room for further agitation." The gentleman who said this is one of the oldest residents of Kansas, one of the leading politicians of the country, secretary of the National Republican Committee, and just now a candidate

for the suffrages of the people of Kansas. Considering his personal views on the question, and his past relation to it, his testimony to the success of prohibition has not a little of the force of evidence given by an unwilling witness contrary to his own interests. We may fairly take what the former opponents of prohibition concede as the present measure of its success.

The peril of the hour is, that under cover of apparent success there may come real defeat. If men who do not believe in the principle of prohibition are admitted to places of power in the State, they can render the constitutional prohibition against liquor as ineffective as the constitutional prohibition against lotteries now is. If candidates for positions on the State ticket will take open ground with the prohibitionists they can safely be trusted, otherwise not. The war is not over. A few battles have been fought and won. Victory seems certain to the prohibition forces; but if they throw away every advantage, and permit an enemy or a friend to use their power and powder for his own ends, it goes without saying that, even if the result be assured, the war will be a long one. While brewers contribute in a convention in Michigan to influence ballots in Kansas, he is a little too sanguine who says that the war is over. Prohibition in Kansas is secure only if its friends retain political power in the State.

James G. Dougherty.

THE CHURCH SCHOOL.—CRITICISMS AND SUGGESTIONS.

WHILE there is no divine warrant from the Bible for organizing and maintaining the Sunday-school, such as we have for our churches, the Christian reasonableness of the institution has set it out upon its second century with an assured authority that no one would care to question.

It is, to be sure, no such an affair as its early life gave promise of. Robert Raikes would not have dreamed that the magnificent institution which claims the time, thought, and money implied in the modern Sunday-school could ever have grown up from the modest undertaking of which he was the father.

In some respects I imagine Saint Robert would deplore the results which have come out of his little enterprise, and perhaps he would go so far as to say, as did some of our wise New England

pastors, that better had the Sabbath-school never have been born than to have grown up to cripple the home training and the pastoral instruction which it has supplanted but by no means made good the place of.

It does not necessarily follow that the evils which are connected with an organization are incident to it and inseparable from it. They may be of such a nature as to be in no sense an outgrowth of its life, but, on the other hand, exist in spite of it, and cease to be as soon as the real life of the institution fully asserts itself.

That there are such parasitical forces at work upon our Sunday-schools is known and deeply deplored by its best and wisest friends. Such a man as Dr. Vincent, who may well be called the Luther of the Institution, loving and serving it as none but a real reformer can, has been forced to criticise it most sharply, among other matters saying that it is marred by frivolity and irreverence, that its teaching is often very superficial, that there is want of enthusiasm in its scholarship. And, wise man that he is, he does not hesitate to say that by all means he would have a child attend public worship rather than the Sunday-school, if he cannot attend but one, — a course directly opposed to the modern heresy, which has made the Sunday-school the children's church.

A prominent educator in one of our western cities has given as his deliberate conviction that the training which the boys and girls have in Sunday-school militates against the discipline of the "day schools," and that he would not hesitate to choose as pupils children out of homes with the training of which the lawlessness of the modern Sabbath-school had not interfered, rather than the average Sunday-school scholar. There are not a few pastors who are looking forward with extreme anxiety to the future of the church as it shall fall into the hands of the young people whose Christian life has been developed in the modern Sunday-school. What kind of hymns and music shall we have? what kind of preaching? who will pay for the prize chromos for attendance in the coming church? I found out the secret of the life of a high-pressure church, with its sensational pulpit and extravagantly salaried choir, when the man who had for years superintended the Sabbath-school told me how much it cost him to buy the cake and candies that he gave to children, most of whom have more of such things at home than they need.

The Sunday-school is of value only as it serves the church well. When the interests of the servant are conserved at the expense of his master, either the servant should change his course or be dis-

missed. Solomon has something of this sort to say when he writes there are two things for which the earth is disquieted: for a servant when he reigneth, and an handmaid that is heir to her mistress. It is to avert this calamity that not a few pastors have come to the decided conviction that, for its own sake and for the sake of the church, the Sabbath-school should be reformed.

To adequately consider this matter, we must keep clearly in mind that there is a sharp and clear distinction between church schools and mission schools. The former are for the benefit of children who have Christian homes, the latter are composed of children whose parents cannot or will not attend church.

The radical idea of these two classes of schools is different, and, while it is true that to the pupil in the mission school the institution should stand in the place of fireside and pulpit instruction, it does not at all follow that the church school should have any such aim before it. With this thought in mind, a few suggestions concerning our church Sunday-schools may not be untimely.

Is it at all necessary to say that, when confined to its appropriate sphere and doing its appointed work, no institution ought to be more sacredly cherished than the Sunday-school? Those of us who have watched the growth of our churches the past few years cannot have failed to observe the appropriateness of calling this institution the nursery of the church. But a nursery will not take care of itself, nor should it become the centre of authority and power in the house.

With these thoughts in mind, I would insist upon it, as a fundamental principle, that a church school should recognize the existence of family religion, or, in other words, that the pupils of such a school should be expected to have home instruction upon, or at least home study of, the lesson.

We appear to have gone upon the basis that the Sabbath-school, in relation to religious truth, holds the same place that the secular schools do in ordinary instruction; and this mistaken notion could not have done the harm that it has, had we given the two kinds of school equal scope. When we send our children to the public school, we expect that out of thirty hours in the school-room they will have from twelve to fifteen hours of study. The Sabbath-school is, on the other hand, simply a place for recitation, and we take no pains to see that even as much time is taken in learning a lesson as is taken in reciting it. Nothing can be more harmful to a child's spiritual life. Information taken in without the cost of study is both cheap and worthless. If our children studied

Exodus as they do grammar, or Matthew as they do arithmetic, or the catechism as they do geography, they would have a far greater relish for the truth than they now have.

The only way to secure genuine love for anything is to be thorough with it. Our only hope in the case before us is to see to it that the children prepare their lessons at home. It is not feasible to afford Sunday-school study hours and teachers to see that they are enforced. There should be study hours at home and the helping hand of that best of all teachers, the parent. We shall never get beyond the divine philosophy which underlies the command, "And ye shall teach them your children, speaking of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, when thou liest down, and when thou risest up." Christian parents do not begin to know what they are losing in their own spiritual life by neglecting to teach their children, as thereby they may keep fresh their own religious views while they feel the inspiration that comes from contact with minds first catching a view of the truth that may have become uninteresting to those who are older from its very familiarity.

We need the inspiration which some of us have found as we have taught our boys the Latin and mathematics which we learned but did not appreciate twenty years ago. It makes us young again to revive these scenes. And none the less will our spiritual life be rejuvenated by hearty coöperation with our children in the pursuit after divine truth.

We are all by and by going to awaken to a consciousness of the perils that threaten our family life, and, closing our ears to the clamor which has driven us into public life, we shall begin to draw closer our curtains, close some of our doors, and fan the dying embers upon the altar of our household religion.

The difficulty has been that the Sabbath-school as an institution has had such vast force of life that it has grown at the expense of the family. That force can but be baneful which saps the life of any divine institution. The two ought to grow side by side. They can do so. Objection may be taken to the method herein proposed of securing recognition of home religious training, on the ground that in every church school there will be many children whose parents are unbelievers. But it is in such cases as these that the beneficence of the principle will be seen. If such parents know that home instruction is a *sine qua non* of attendance upon the school, they will see to it that their children study, and will prize the institution because of its thoroughness. Very few of them will

teach their little ones infidelity, while many, in trying to impart the truth to their children, may be brought under the influence of truth in its most attractive and persuasive form, and truth is never powerless.

Another fundamental principle in this matter is that the Sunday-school must recognize the fact that the church exists before and above the school, — in other words, to put the truth in a practical way, of the two the child should go to church rather than to the Sunday-school, if he can attend only one.

To be sure, the child may miss the picture-paper. If so, subscribe for it as you do for your own paper; he will prize it the more. The very freeness of our Sunday-school papers is cheapening them in the estimation of the children. Of course it will be a source of grief not to meet one's playmates and enjoy the sly conversation that is dexterously wedged into the breaks in Sunday-school exercises. It may be that the child will feel the need of the money that he has hitherto earned in securing new scholars, but it is to be presumed that money can be secured for him in ways fully as unobjectionable. Perhaps the dear child has come to live on the story-books with which too many of our Sunday-school libraries abound, but the sooner he has learned the damage to heart and head which such trash occasions the better it will be for his future.

No doubt there will be a rebellion in prospect of an exchange of Sunday-school for church. But it is to be hoped that the child's preferences are not superior to the parent's principles. Most children prefer candy to potatoes, but few have parents who feed their offspring upon sweetmeats instead of substantials.

The preaching of the gospel is a divine institution, and parents run a fearful risk in allowing their children to neglect it. In addition to this, the church needs the children in the congregation. The minister is in danger of philosophizing rather than preaching, unless he have the children before him in the sanctuary.

And more than this, the teaching of the pulpit, from the nature of the case, is more valuable than that of the Sabbath-school. There are very few laymen who have had the time or the opportunity to acquire well-balanced views of truth; and if it be the case that there is power in the truth in the direction of converting the soul, how marvelously important it is that the presentation of the truth should be not only entertaining but sound.

The whole argument upon which is based all the collegiate and theological training of our ministry is in force when the question

is being answered who are to teach the children divine truth. No one ever knew too much to teach a child. The more complete our training the better will be our hold upon the truths which our children need. How the children must have enjoyed Jesus' teaching and preaching! A sermon which an average child cannot get anything out of will not be of benefit to an average congregation, if it will be to any congregation. And a child whose training does not include listening to a thoughtful, serious presentation of the truth from the pulpit is not in the Christian way.

There is need of mental heroism which will inspire our children to seek after instruction rather than to simply allow themselves to be entertained. There is ruin in many directions in an institution which effeminates by a round of exercises that awaken interest rather than devotion, and which subsidizes by the giving of prizes and premiums, and picnics and Christmas trees.

Enterprise has run away with our religion in many directions. If a new departure signifies a return to good old ways that ought never to have been abandoned, there is room for it in the direction of the relation of the children to the church.

I cannot believe that the Sunday-school is necessarily a foe to the home and the church. It is the abuse rather than the legitimate use of the institution which has made so many parents childless, so far as having children to go with them to the kingdom is concerned. It is a deplorable thing when a little child loves and imitates and obeys a nurse-girl rather than his mother, unless the nurse is superior to her mistress. Has modern Christianity found an institution which can supplant the divine institution, the church?

The Sunday-school, rightly used, is one of the choicest gifts of God to the world. Its flexibility, its enthusiasm, its personal contact of teachers and pupils, its fund of suggestions and help derived from the thoughts and prayers of faithful workers the world over give it marvelous power; and as long as children love to be with each other, and men and women love children, and the time of our youth is the best time to receive religious impressions, so long will we cherish and care for the Sabbath-school.

And that it may do the most for the church, the home, and the world, there are three lines upon which it will seek to secure the best results.

1st. In respect of its general management. The success of an organization depends upon its head more than upon any one thing. As much care should be taken in the choice of a superintendent of

the Sunday-school as in the selection of a pastor. There may not be as broad a field to choose from, but no pains should be spared to secure and support the best man for the place. He will from the very nature of the case love the souls of children, and believe that they can be early won to the Master. He will have faith in the truth, and in the power of the Holy Spirit to enforce the truth, and hence will not rely upon anything short of this to accomplish his work. He will never sacrifice the instruction of the scholars to mere exhibition of forces. His company will rarely be on dress parade; it does not exist for May-day-training.

2d. In respect of its teaching, the Sunday-school cannot aim too high. Nothing is more hopeful in this direction than the zeal and wisdom of many leading Sunday-school men, as they are affording each year better appliances for the aid of teachers in our Sunday-schools. It is a pernicious practice which gives to a newly made young church member a class in the Sabbath-school simply because it will do her good to teach.

The world of modern literature is so full of covert infidelity, and the business world of so many false maxims of trade, and the world of fashion is so unchristian, that we need as religious instructors of the young those who have sterling integrity of character, culture, trained minds, who can command the respect and admiration of their pupils. This does not always imply great learning or profound ability, nor surpassing elegance of appearance. It is the result of a Christ-like life, upright dealing, fair ability, and careful, patient labor.

Some of us are getting out of conceit with our public school system, because it takes coarse daughters of ill-bred homes, who, in virtue of graduation from the high and training-schools, are entitled to teachers' certificates, and places them in charge of children who have been taught gentle manners, have refined sensibilities, and a keen sense of honor. And as fathers and mothers shall come to care as greatly for the piety as they do for the manners of their offspring, as earnestly for their instruction in the principles of the kingdom of heaven as they do for their information concerning science and art, they will more and more demand that those who teach their children in the Sabbath-school shall have mental, moral, and spiritual fitness for their positions.

3d. In respect of the attainments made by the pupils. Studiousness and excellence of behavior in the Sunday-school should have their reward, as they do in secular schools, by regular promotion.

Not, indeed, that our Sunday-schools should ever encourage the curse of working for marks, or seeking promotion for promotion's sake. It is possible to secure excellence for excellence's sake, but to do this the pupil must not fail of knowing that virtue has its legitimate reward. It may answer for men who have subjected themselves to prolonged moral training to declare that they do right solely because it is right without the slightest expectation of reward, with utter indifference in respect of the consequences. The average child holds a philosophy which links happiness with holiness. Not that he needs prizes or rewards, save such as are legitimately connected with faithful work, namely, the opportunity to do better work. We sometimes blame our larger boys and girls because they abandon the Sabbath-school. They are moving on in their studies which they pursue in the intermediate, the grammar, and the high school, but when Sunday comes, they must go into the same class, and with the same teacher and the same kind of instruction which they have had for years past, and be expected to be interested. They will not be interested unless they are profited. They cannot be profited if they must be classed with others who, having abandoned their studies for business or to be idle, are neither able nor willing to pursue sacred truth in a scholarly way. Make it possible for bright young men and women to gain the best things intellectually and spiritually in the Sabbath-school, and there will be no difficulty in retaining them. They will be fewer in number, in proportion to those of their own age, than will be found in the lower classes. The same is true in our public schools. The higher classes are made up largely on the basis of the survival of the fittest. The only point that I desire to make is, that the Sabbath-school ought to have an atmosphere which should permit the "fittest" to survive.

But why more? It is a well-nigh thankless task to suggest radical reforms in an institution which, because it is sacred, regards itself as above the reach of ordinary secular principles and methods. Is it not time to learn that an institution, because it is holy, should be for that reason none the less sensible? Piety ought to cease paying a premium to sentimentalism. Religion and tact ought never to be divorced. The more holy the work we are engaged in, the more careful should be our scrutiny of the methods which we employ, and the more solicitous should we be to win success.

There is no work of the church of to-day which has larger possibilities for usefulness than that which we are trying to do in our

Sabbath-schools. These possibilities will never be met until the threefold cord — the home, the church, and the school — is made perfect by the perfection of each strand. That the drift of thought in our day is in this very direction is one of the most hopeful signs of the time.

"Let us live for our children" is the watchword of the hour. There are three who should hear it, and with it conquer the world for Jesus, — the Teacher, the Pastor, and the Parent; and the last is first, if the first is not last. The three together can do what either two without the third could never accomplish.

James G. Merrill.

PROTESTANT MISSIONS IN EAST AFRICA.

[Continued from page 404.]

THE London Missionary Society chose for its position in the missionary advance Lake Tanganyika and its vicinity. Mr. Arthington offered them £5,000 to plant a station and keep a steamer on the lake. This proposal was accepted March 15, 1876, and the Rev. Roger Price, who had had long experience in the South African missions of the society, was sent to make preliminary investigations. One object was to find out whether ox-wagons, such as are commonly used in South Africa, could not with advantage be substituted for the native carriers. The first experiment was very successful. Mr. Price, with his bullock-wagons, reached Mpwapwa from Saadani in seventeen days, and, after a short rest, made the return journey in sixteen. The missionary company, with a complete outfit, such as the experience of pioneer missions demanded, including smiths' and carpenters' tools, surgical instruments and medical stores, surveying instruments, canned provisions, etc., was assembled at Zanzibar. Oxen and Kaffir drivers were brought from the Cape, and the expedition began its advance.

The wagon train got on but slowly over the bad road; the oxen began to die, and in a few weeks of 105 only 20 were left. In consequence of this failure a long delay occurred. Mr. Price and another missionary returned to South Africa. Embarrassed by the difficulty of moving their heavy stores, a great part of which were still on the coast, and awaiting instructions from the authorities at home, the corps, now reduced to four men, remained for several months encamped at Kirasa, forty miles from Mpwapwa.

At last arrangements were made with Broyon, a French trader,

to forward the bulk of the stores, and leaving one of their number, Dodgshun, to accompany him, Messrs. Thompson, Hore, and Hutley set out from Mpwapwa June 12, 1878, and arrived at Ujiji on the lake, August 23d, having made a good journey of seventy-three days. A spot was selected for a station three miles from the town of Ujiji, but hardly had this been done when Thompson, the leader of the expedition, died (September 22, 1878). Dodgshun, following with the goods caravan, reached Uyii in the end of December. Beyond this point difficulties arose with Mirambo, who seized all the goods. After vain efforts to recover them, Dodgshun pushed on to the lake. He reached Ujiji March 29, 1879, and, worn out by labors and anxieties, died eleven days later.¹ The work of the missionaries in Ujiji was hindered by the influence of the Arabs and Moslem Wasuaheli, but they made progress in gaining the friendship of the natives. Mr. Hore explored the lake, and made the important discovery that the Lukuga River is its outlet, thus establishing its connection with the drainage system of the Lualaba-Congo.

In the spring of 1879 the society sent forward a new expedition under the lead of Dr. Mullens, the foreign secretary of the society. Dr. Mullens died at Chakombe, near Mpwapwa, in July, 1879; his companions, the Rev. W. Griffith and Mr. Southon, a medical missionary, reach Ujiji September 23d. On their way they recovered, at Urambo, the goods which the king had seized.

Upon their arrival, the mission divided its forces. Mr. Hore remained at Ujiji. Dr. Southon returned to Urambo, two hundred miles from the lake, to work among the Wanyamwezi, Mr. Griffith and Mr. Hutley crossed the lake and established a station at Mtowa, in Uguha, the gateway leading from Tanganyika to the west. Three more missionaries followed them, one of whom, the Rev. D. Williams, died, and the other two soon returned invalided. Mr. Hutley, also, had for the time to withdraw, leaving only three men in the field.

In 1880 James Stevenson, Esq., offered the London Missionary Society and Livingstonia mission on the Nyassa, to give £4,000 to connect the Nyassa with Lake Tanganyika by a ten-foot road, and to maintain steam communication on the lakes. The London Society, on its part, was to keep a steamer on Lake Tanganyika, and establish a new station at its southern end. The

¹ It was afterwards found that the seizure of the goods by Mirambo was made in the belief that they belonged to M. Broyon; when he learned that they were the property of the mission he returned them.

Scotch mission to build a road from the point near the northern end of the Nyassa to Malinwanda, about fifty miles, where they will have a station. The Central African Trading Company will maintain communication on Nyassa and the rivers, and undertake the maintenance of the road after its completion. A glance at the map shows the great advantage of this route. Instead of eight hundred miles of carriage, goods can be transported by water all the way, except the portage around the rapids in the Shiré (Murchison Falls), and somewhat over two hundred miles between the two lakes.

In May, 1882, a large reinforcement set out from England. Five ordained missionaries, two artisans, and a sailor, accompanied Mr. Hore returning to his post. They took with them a steel life-boat in sections; a larger vessel, the steam-launch *Good News*, followed by the Nyassa route. At the end of October, 1882, two of the company reached Urambo, where they learned from Mr. Copplestone the sad particulars of Dr. Southon's death, one of the heaviest losses the mission has suffered. He was wounded in the arm by the accidental discharge of a gun in the hands of a servant. Mr. Copplestone was sent for from Uyui and amputated the arm, but unfortunately not high enough. A second operation was necessary, but it did not save his life. After great suffering, he died July 26, 1882, thirty-one years old. One of the missionaries of the last company, Mr. Penry, turned back sick, and died at Kisokwe April 23, 1883, the sixth death in the London Society's Central African mission.

Captain Hore and Mr. Swann, with the life-boat, reached Ujiji February 23, 1883, and by this time, no doubt, the steamer is also on the lake, as the sections had safely reached the head of the Nyassa several months ago.¹

On the Nyassa the Scotch Free Church has a strong mission. The first suggestion of an extension of the work in this direction was made more than twenty years ago. Livingstone in 1865, when the guest of Dr. Wilson, of Bombay, expressed his wish that the Free Church might establish a mission on the heights near this lake. In the winter of 1873-74 the question of a mission in Central Africa was discussed with fresh interest, and the Nyassa was chosen as its field, largely upon the advice of Dr.

¹ Summary at the last reports: *Ujiji*, Captain E. C. Hore, A. J. Swann; *Urambo*, Rev. Messrs. T. F. Shaw and W. C. Willoughby; *Uguha*, Rev. Messrs. W. Griffith, D. P. Jones; at the south end of the lake, — station not yet fixed, — Rev. J. H. Dineen, Messrs. A. Brooks, J. Dunn, artisans.

Stewart, whose experience and success in the South African mission of the society gave great weight to his counsel. Conference was had with the other Presbyterian Churches of Scotland. The Reformed Presbyterian Church agreed to take part in the support of the mission, as did also the United Presbyterian Church, which gave for the work the very able medical missionary Dr. Laws. An understanding was also had with the Church of Scotland in reference to the mission which it proposed in the same region. At the head of the expedition was Lieutenant E. D. Young, R. N., who had been two years with Livingstone and had also visited the Nyassa in the Livingstone Search Expedition. Beside the Rev. Robert Laws, medical missionary, the corps consisted of two engineers, one of them a blacksmith, a carpenter, a seaman, and an agriculturist. They took out a steam-launch, all of steel, named the *Ilala*, from the place of Livingstone's death, beside two boats for river service. The expedition landed at the mouth of the Zambesi, July 23, 1875, the *Ilala* was put together and steamed up to the Murchison Falls, where she had to be taken to pieces and carried around the rapids to the upper Shiré, forty or fifty miles through a rough country. This, the most difficult part of the task, having been successfully accomplished, the little steamer was put together again, and proceeding up the river entered the lake October 12th. After some exploration a site was chosen for the station on the west side of Cape Maclear, and the name *Livingstonia* given to it. Four more men joined them in 1876, one of them a medically educated clergyman, William Black. Warned by the disasters of the Universities' mission in this region, the missionaries had received the strictest injunctions that no active interference with the slave trade must be attempted. Their very presence, however, served as a check upon it. Young was relieved in October, 1876, by the Rev. Dr. Stewart, and returned to England. The mission was now called upon to help in the establishment of the mission of the Established Church at Blantyre, on the highlands, east of the Shiré, in the vicinity of the Murchison Falls, and during the greater part of 1877 the force of the *Livingstonia* mission was thus divided. Death removed two of the most energetic workers, the Rev. Mr. Black, and Shadrach Ngwana, a Zulu catechist from the school at Lovedale. No great opposition on the part of the natives was encountered. A school was opened, and soon reached an attendance of over thirty, — the boys assisting the mechanics in their work, and learning the use of tools. The confidence of the people was shown by the increas-

ing population about the station. The year 1878 was one of progress. A church and school building was completed; also a storehouse with walls of sun-dried bricks. These, as well as the woodwork of the buildings, were the work of natives. A very dry season was unfavorable to agriculture, nevertheless thirteen acres of land had been reclaimed; two acres were in sugar-cane; the walks around the station had been planted with cocoanut palms, blue gums, and mango trees. The attendance on the Sunday services had risen to an average of 120, the school had 65 pupils on the roll with an average attendance of 40. The medical work had rapidly increased. Missionary journeys had been made among some of the neighboring tribes. In 1879 Mr. James Stewart, C. E., of the mission staff, and Mr. J. Moir, of the Trading Company, explored the northern end of the Nyassa and the fine plateau between it and Lake Tanganyika, a great service both to missions and science. Miss Watterson, a medical missionary, was added to the staff, and before the year closed had Bible reading, sewing, cooking, and housekeeping classes, beside numerous patients.

In the following year it was decided to remove the principal station from Cape Maclear to Bandawe, on the west side of the lake, about the middle of its length, and a site for a sanitarium was selected in the mountains, thirty or forty miles away, at Mombera. It was also resolved to establish a station at the northern end of the lake among the Choongoos. The working force of the mission was increased by six Zulu evangelists, trained in the South African missions of the society. In consequence of a great migration of Zulus some generations ago, numerous powerful tribes around the lake can be reached in that language. At Livingstonia services were conducted entirely in the Chinyanga; preaching was also kept up in Mpango's villages, not far away.

The explorer, Mr. Joseph Thompson, writes of this mission: "Where international effort has failed¹ an unassuming mission has been quietly and unostentatiously realizing in its own district the entire programme of the Brussels conference. This mission has proved itself in every sense a civilizing centre. By it slavery has been stopped, desolating wars put an end to, and peace and security given to a wide area of country." The first baptism at Livingstonia took place March 27, 1881, and the next day the headquarters of the mission were removed to Bandawe, where a manse and houses for the artisan evangelists had been built. At

¹ Referring to the plan of the international scientific stations.

Cape Maclear, the work was left for the time in the charge of the native catechist Namalambé. Mr. Stewart, having undertaken the construction of Mr. Stevenson's Lakes Junction Road, was released from mission work. Other changes in the staff were made necessary by sickness, but it was speedily brought up to its full strength.

The year 1882, in the Nyassa region, was a time of wars and rumors of war, but the mission was not disturbed by them. Great progress was made in every direction. At Bandawe a brick school-house was finished, beside workshops and other buildings. Mombera, in the midst of a tribe of Kaffir descent and tongue, was occupied by a Zulu evangelist, Wm. Koyi, who was afterward joined by Mr. Sutherland, as teacher. The chief having given permission to preach, congregations of as many as 1,500 gathered in his kraal. A school is to be opened at once. A school was also begun in the vicinity of Malinwanda's village, on the lakes road, which had been constructed from Karonga, thus far, and the Rev. Mr. Bain took charge of the work there. The attendance on Sunday service at the central station ranged from 150 to 1,000, and in the surrounding towns from 50 to 400 or even 700; four natives had been baptized, 3,104 medical cases treated, 300 boys and girls were in the schools. The whole of the New Testament, beside a number of hymns, has been translated into the Chin-yanga, the language of the people on the southeast of the lake. The cause of missions and of civilization, in this region, has recently suffered a great loss in the death of Mr. James Stewart, C. E., which occurred August 31, 1883, while engaged in construction of the lakes road.

The General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, in 1875, sanctioned the establishment of a mission to East Africa, and a pioneer, Mr. H. Henderson, went out with Lieutenant Young's party. The main body of six men, with Dr. T. T. Macklin at their head, arrived at Quilimane August 9, 1876, and reached the highlands east of the falls in the Shiré, October 23d. The original design had been to plant this mission on the Nyassa, at some distance from that of the Free Church, but the shifting of population along the shores of the lake, due to the incessant slave raids, caused a different course to be pursued. The spot chosen for the station, which bears its name, Blantyre, from Livingstone's birthplace, is about half way between the river Shiré and Lake Shirwa. It is on a terrace, over three thousand feet above the sea; the climate is cool, the soil fertile, a fine stream is close by, timber is abun-

dant, the neighboring tribes friendly. No other mission in East or Central Africa has so many natural advantages. The station was laid out by Dr. Stewart and Mr. J. Stewart, C. E., of the Free Church mission. Two main roads were constructed at the cost of the two churches, one leading to the foot of the cataracts, thirty-five miles, the other to the upper Shiré above the falls, somewhat longer. The industrial side of the mission work made rapid progress. By the end of 1877 ten acres were under cultivation. The missionaries were learning the language, and translating into the Chiao parts of the Scriptures—first Genesis, Jonah, Matthew—and the shorter catechism, “somewhat simplified.” The school enrolled one hundred scholars; an out-station was occupied at Zomba, forty miles north of Blantyre on the south side of the mountain.

One familiar with the history of missions in East Africa could scarcely read without anxiety, in successive reports, that Blantyre was become “a home of refuge for the slave,” and that the number of fugitive slaves about the station was increasing. Otherwise every word that reached Europe was most encouraging. There was, therefore, no little surprise as well as chagrin among the friends of missions in Scotland when, in April, 1880, Mr. Andrew Chirnside, F. R. G. S., published his pamphlet, “The Blantyre Missionaries, Discreditable Disclosures.” The author, who had visited Blantyre in August, 1879, on a hunting expedition, charged the missionaries with taking the law into their own hands and punishing the natives with great cruelty. An alleged murderer had been shot with their consent, if not at their command; for minor offenses men had been mercilessly flogged, or imprisoned in a pit; at Zomba they had been engaged in armed encounters with the natives,—as he called it, a war. A special commissioner, the Rev. Dr. Rankin, was sent out, whose report showed that although Chirnside’s pamphlet was somewhat highly colored, there was substantial ground for most of his accusations. The finding of the Committee on Foreign Missions was, that “various acts of cruelty, retaliation, and indiscretion have been committed by several of their mission agents, between September, 1877, and September, 1879.” The Rev. Mr. McDonald, the head of the mission, was at once recalled, together with two of the artisans. Dr. Macklin, who was already at home, was discharged from the service of the mission. The difficulties and abuses were found to have arisen chiefly from the harboring of runaway slaves, and from the excessive zeal with which the industrial department of the

work had been pushed. It was decided to drop this branch of the work altogether; and very strict instructions were given to the missionaries in regard to their interference with slavery. A new staff was sent out and the work begun again. Anxieties have more recently been caused by the threatened Portuguese occupation of points on the Shiré or the lake, and by rumors of war between the Makololos on the river and Chipatula. The mission has been called to mourn the death of two of its members, Mrs. Nicholl, only six days after her arrival, and, a week or two later, Mrs. Duncan, who had been for four or five years at Blantyre. More recently surveys have been made looking to extension in the direction of Lake Shirwa.

We cannot take leave of these missions without referring to the great support they have received from the Trading Company, under the management of Messrs. J. and F. Moir, who, with ten or twelve European subordinates, operate from Quilimane to the head of the Nyassa. Nothing can do more to make the work of the missionary in Africa successful than the establishment of honest Christian commerce, instead of the Arab, slave, and ivory traders, or, as on the west coast, and now in Madagascar, of unprincipled Europeans with their rum and brandy. Such a work, done in a Christian spirit, is more than an auxiliary to missions, it is a mission itself.

In 1880 the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, at the suggestion of the Natal Zulu Mission, decided to extend their work in the direction of Umzila's kingdom, a large region south of the Zambesi River. As the Zulu is spoken throughout that country, the missionaries and native helpers from Natal were prepared to go to work in the new field without the usual delay of learning the language. The Rev. Myron W. Pinkerton, one of the younger members of the Zulu Mission, was invited to organize an expedition to make the necessary preliminary explorations. He returned to America for a short visit, and left his family here until he should be ready to settle in the new field. He left New York May 15, 1880, and after many delays and accidents on sea and land reached Inhambane October 3, 1880. On the 19th of October he set out for Umzila's country, accompanied by Mr. E. Jourdan, an American ship officer, and John Pohleni, a Zulu Christian. On November 3d they reached the borders of a famine country, and while waiting for provisions to be brought up Mr. Pinkerton was taken ill with fever, and died on the 10th.

October 9, 1880, the Rev. E. H. Richards and wife left America

to join Mr. Pinkerton in his undertaking. They learned before landing at Natal that Mr. Pinkerton had fallen by the way. Mr. Richards stayed in Natal studying the language until May, 1881. Then, as no other missionary could be spared to go with him, he started with two native Christians to join Mr. Jourdan at Inhambane, and try again to reach Umzila's country. After the usual African delays and trials, Mr. Richards began his inland journey June 24th. He was well received all along the line of his march, and had many invitations from the different chiefs to establish missions in their countries.

On October 10 the party reached Umoyamuhle, the king's city. They found Umzila a fine looking man, with an intelligent, pleasant face and manners. He received them kindly, and after several interviews consented to their establishing a mission in his country, asking for five missionaries and their wives to come and begin the work among his people. He insisted upon the families coming, for he wished the missionaries to stay, if they came at all, and urged their coming quickly. The country Mr. Richards described as a delightful garden, with plenty of hills, woods, grass, water, food, etc. The people are divided into two classes, the Amatonga (the original owners of the country) and the Amanguni, the Zulu lords, with Umzila for their chief. The Amanguni speak pure Zulu, the court language. The Amatonga have a dialect of their own, but are quite familiar with the Zulu.¹ Mr. Richards returned to Natal as soon as he had reached this understanding with Umzila.

Mr. Richards and his wife held themselves ready to go in with Mr. Wilcox (whose wife would follow soon after) to possess this land. But no native Christians could be found willing and ready to go with them, so they were forced to wait until another May, hoping for more men from America and praying that some Zulu Christians might be found ready to consecrate themselves to the work. In the mean time Mr. Wilcox asked and received permission to explore the country about Inhambane, with the view of planting a mission station in that field. In the Board Report of 1883, the latest information in regard to this mission to Umzila's country is that Mr. Richards and wife are still waiting for reinforcements. Mr. Wilcox has just gone again to Inhambane to begin the mission work there, Mr. Richards assisting him, until the way is open to the Umzila mission; Mrs. Richards helping in a girl's school in Natal.

¹ *Annual Report A. B. C. F. M.*, 1882, p. 18.

It was my desire to include in this paper some account of the Roman Catholic missions in Central Africa, and also of the work which, in pursuance of the plan of the Brussels conference, has been done by the international scientific expeditions and stations, we should then have before us all the forces which are now at work to change the face and the heart of Africa; but I have already exceeded my limits and must leave this part of my plan to some other hand. One thing comes out in this rapid survey of a part of the work: through all East Africa, covering twenty degrees of latitude and extending eight hundred miles inland, missions have been planted, and they will not be withdrawn. The cost in life and money has been great and will be greater, but the church will not count it too much for the regeneration of a continent.

George F. Moore.

BAPTISM IN THE "TEACHING" AND IN EARLY CHRISTIAN ART.

IN commenting in the April number of this Review on the injunction in the "Teaching" to administer baptism in a given case by affusion, reference was made to the testimony of Christian art.

It may be of service at this time to submit this evidence in some detail. We shall not attempt an exhaustive review of it, but merely such a presentation as will clearly indicate its character and bearing. The figures which are introduced are obtained by photo-engraving from plates published by Father Garucci in his "*Storia dell' arte cristiana*," or by Commendatore De Rossi in his "*Bulletino di archeologia cristiana*." Their interest, especially in the form here presented, is quite exclusively archaeological. The early Christian artists rarely exhibit proficiency in drawing, and when their productions are divested of color and reduced to mere outlines, the lack of skill becomes conspicuous. Yet, for the purpose now in view, such sketches are of no little value. Those who examine them can see at once for themselves whatever these early designs may embody of the Christian tradition, respecting one of the sacraments of the Church.

Figure 1 is a copy¹ of a fresco in the Crypt of St. Lucina, the oldest part of the Roman catacomb of St. Callistus. The extreme

¹ Figures 1, 2, 3, 6, and 7 are from Garucci's plates.

antiquity of this section and of this picture is generally conceded. Leading authorities agree in assigning to it a date prior to the close of the second century.¹ It depicts one man unclothed stepping up from water, which reaches a little above the knee, and with his hand joined to that extended by another clad in a tunic



FIGURE 1.

and standing on a bank or shore. In the air hovers a dove holding, apparently, a twig or leaf in its mouth.² There seems to be no reason for questioning the ordinary interpretation of this picture, that it represents the close of the baptism of Jesus as described in Matt. iii. 16: "And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway from the water: and lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending as a dove and coming upon him."³

¹ Cf. Roller, *Les Catacombes de Rome*, vol. i. p. 97 (Paris, 1881), De Rossi, *Rom. Sott.*, tom. i. lib. 3, cap. 3.

² In De Rossi's plate the form of a leaf is not apparent as in Garucci's, and the water lines are less confused. The fresco is much effaced, yet the main features are plainly discernible.

³ Victor Schulze, *Die Katakomben*, pp. 313, 314 (Leipzig, 1882), says that we should recognize in this fresco the baptism of a member of the family owning the burial chamber. The dove signifies that he died soon after receiving the rite. Schulze objects to the common interpretation that such a representation of Christ in Christian antiquity is not to be thought of, and that the twig which the

The originals of Figures 2 and 3 are to be found in two of the oldest of the six so-called "Chambers of the Sacraments" in the Catacomb of St. Callistus proper. These two chambers belong to the first period of excavation, — a period whose date has been quite definitely ascertained, — and there is no disagreement among competent judges as to the contemporaneous origin of the decorations. This carries them back to very late in the second or very early in the third century, with probably a short interval of time between the two.¹



FIGURE 2.

dove carries shows it to be Noah's dove, the bearer of heavenly peace, and not the Holy Spirit. The first objection is of no weight. The absence of drapery is a mere historical and ritual incident often repeated in later pictures. (See Garucci, *Op. cit.* i. 372; also, Figures 6 and 7.) The twig held by the dove cannot give the key to the interpretation to the neglect of the main action. Schulze himself really assigns to the dove a double office. It symbolizes at once Noah's dove and the spirit of the subject of baptism. The artist may have made another combination.

Garucci proposes an interpretation founded on Ps. lxx. 1, 2. (*Op. cit.* i. 422.) But the picture says nothing of "deep waters" and "floods." He admits, when he explains his plate, that the common understanding of the picture may be correct (*ib.* ii. 8).

Another very ancient fresco, in the Catacomb of Prætextatus, Rome, is claimed by Roller as a representation of the baptism of Christ. Garucci concurs in this explanation. We have not reproduced it because no thoroughly trustworthy copy has yet been published, and from such evidence as we possess we cannot deem it a baptism. If it should prove to be one it would exhibit the rite as sprinkling or affusion alone, for there is no other indication of water than the sprays about the head. See Roller, *op. cit.* i. 102, also Pl. xviii, 2; Garucci, *op. cit.* ii. 46, with *tav.* 39, 1; De Rossi, *Bull. di arch. crist.*, 1872, p. 64; Northcote and Brownlow, *Rom. Sott.* ii. 145-147; Parker, *Catacombe*, Pl. xiii. Mr. Parker admits this and associated pictures to be "probably of the third century," but omits from his drawings very important features given by Roller, Garucci, and others.

¹ Schulze, in his valuable *Archäologische Studien über altchrist. Monumente* (Wien, 1880), goes into a thorough critical discussion of the frescoes in the Sacrament chapels. As to their date he expresses a general agreement with the results of the archaeological and architectonic investigations of the brothers De Rossi. He thinks, however, that the series of pictures to which Figure 3 belongs is probably at least two decades later than the group which includes Figure 2. That the entire cycle of the six chambers, he remarks, "belongs to

In the one picture a man, wearing a toga and holding a roll in his left hand, lays his right hand upon the head of a boy who stands



FIGURE 3.

in water which seems to be scarcely ankle deep.¹ In the other the copious sprinkling or affusion of water is made conspicuous, and the recipient of the rite is a little more deeply immersed. Schulze speaks of the water as reaching to the knees, but none of the plates, whether De Rossi's, Garucci's, Roller's, or even Schulze's so represent it even in Figure 3. De Rossi, in guarded phrase, calls this standing in the water a "slight immersion" (*poca immersione*), and says that the water is hardly up to the knees (*appena fino alle ginocchia*).² With this qualification, the description is still rather strong as applied to Figure 2. M. Roller says that the neophyte has entered the river scarcely to the ankle-bone.³

We have thus in each of these three oldest representations of baptism (1) the administrator of the rite represented as standing upon dry ground, (2) more or less robed, while (8) the subject of baptism is unclothed, and (4) is partially in the water. Looking at Figure 3, which Schulze rightly regards as more realistic than Figure 2, we see (5) the actual administration of the rite by a sprinkling so abundant as to be more properly described as an affusion.

The simple question then is, whether in chambers whose manifold decorations reveal unmistakably the Christian spirit, which very the first half of the third century appears to be indisputable." Schulze is a Protestant, a "Docent" in the University of Leipsic, and aims with commendable though not entire success at a purely scientific treatment of Christian archæology.

¹ In Figure 2 Garucci finds the rite "which in the Catholic Church is called confirmation" (p. 12). Waiving the question of an anachronism this interpretation overlooks the fact that the subject of the rite is still standing in the water. According to Tertullian, confirmation, or the laying on of the hand, was administered after the candidate had left the water and other ceremonies had been performed. See Schulze, *Arch. Stud.* p. 56, who cites Tert. *De resurr.* c. 8; *De bapt.* c. 7. If it be supposed that the artist has represented in one view various moments of baptism, including confirmation, this is possible, but does not affect the use we have made of the picture.

² *Rom. Sott.* ii. 333.

³ *Les Catacombes de Rome*, vol. i. p. 131.

soon, if not already, were under the care and administration of the church of Rome, — then, as Irenæus recognizes, the most representative church in existence, — the rite of baptism could thus be depicted if the apostles had definitely and absolutely prescribed a different mode as essential and necessary? The question seems to us to be answerable only in one way. The early Christian consciousness, the primitive tradition, admitted liberty in this matter. And it is scarcely possible that in this recognition it could have misunderstood the apostolic teaching. Rites, we know, were enlarged, accumulated, perverted, but a substitution at this early date of one rite for another, an abandonment of baptism for something that either directly or by obvious and necessary implication the apostles had taught is not baptism, — this is something very different and incredible.

It will be replied that authorities differ as to the age of these pictures. But this is incorrect. De Rossi's remarkable discoveries, his thorough investigation of details, his combination of evidence gathered from every department of archæology, have secured for his main conclusions almost universal acceptance.¹ And other

¹ Roller states (*Op. cit.* i. p. 125) that De Rossi's earlier topographical investigations led him to fix the date of the pictures before us approximately in the time of Pope Fabian (A. D. 236-249). It is characteristic of the man to form his judgments thus cautiously and tentatively, and to test them by all appropriate criteria. So far as I have noticed, the leading later histories of art imply the general correctness of his judgment as to the dates of pictures in the Catacombs. Among eminent archæologists we know of but one who dissents, the late Mr. J. H. Parker, C. B., F. S. A. In his work on the Catacombs (Preface p. xi.) he roundly affirms of their pictures: "There are no religious subjects before the time of Constantine." So sweeping a declaration shows that Mr. Parker is rather uttering a ringing Protestant protest against the zealotry which treats everything in the Catacombs as a relic from the age of the Martyrs, than expressing a sober critical judgment respecting particular pictures. It is not surprising, therefore, that Mr. Parker does not himself apparently adhere to this dictum, for on page 72 he seems to refer several paintings of Scripture subjects to "the second or third centuries." As his opinion is so much quoted in this country, it is fitting to notice not merely that it stands alone, but that it cannot fairly be cited as of authority. Mr. Parker's judgment in architecture is of much weight. This was his specialty. And it is noteworthy that in this department his authority sustains generally De Rossi's architectonic conclusions. But Mr. Parker was not a specialist in respect to paintings. The writer was much helped by him, as well as by Mr. Hemans and De Rossi, in his studies in Rome of the early Christian monuments, and in matters of construction has a very high appreciation of his services and ability, but in a question of the age of the paintings in the Catacombs other considerations demand attention, and the opinion, it is confidently believed, will not be questioned by any one conversant with the facts, that in this sphere either of the other two gentlemen named has shown himself far more competent to render a decision.

independent studies, as those of Hemans, Schulze, Roller, and others, have strengthened this unanimity.

It will be further objected that, even if the antiquity of these pictures is probable, their interpretation is doubtful. The best authorities disagree. The same objection arises in respect to every teaching of the New Testament. And there is the same gratifying progress in respect to the teaching of these early pictures as in respect to that of the Canonical Scriptures. When the pictures are allowed to speak for themselves, there is not much room for doubt as to their meaning. The weightiest name in opposition to those who find unmistakable evidence of affusion in the Catacomb pictures is Victor Schulze's. In his work on the Catacombs he says: "The representations of baptism in the period before Constantine, amounting to three in number, all show subjects past the age of childhood (*erwachsene Täuflinge*), — in two cases boys of perhaps twelve years, in the third a young man. The act is performed by immersion."¹ And by immersion is meant submersion. Fortunately, in another work² the author gives us his reasons for this summary judgment, and it is evident that the decisive one is derived not from the pictures, but from the patristic evidence that immersion was the established mode of baptism. That is, since Tertullian and the church generally, at the time these pictures were painted, knew only baptism by immersion, we must interpret these pictures to signify the same thing. And so Schulze supposes that the sprays of water flying in all directions from the head of a boy standing perfectly erect and motionless in water quite below his knees are produced by his having just dipped! Singular water and no less remarkable boy! It is one of the benefits accruing from the discovery of the "Teaching," with its unmistakable testimony that baptism does not necessarily and always imply dipping or plunging, that the pictures can now be allowed to tell their own story without being forced to agree with Tertullian or some other church teacher or father. And when this lesson is fully learned we believe that there will be no more doubt as to the meaning of these and other pictures in the Catacombs than there will be about the meaning of the Gospels when a truly scientific exegesis is established.

But we are reminded here that De Rossi himself interprets these pictures to mean immersion. And perhaps it will be added that Kraus and Martigny recognize the same signification. They do use the term immersion in connection with these and similar

¹ *Die Katakomben*, p. 136.

² *Archäologische Studien*, p. 55.

frescoes. But they do not intend, by immersion, submersion, nor attach to it primary importance. A not unnatural misunderstanding of De Rossi's language deserves to be set right, and the correction will answer for any similar misapprehension of Martigny or Kraus. He entitles his paragraph on the mode of baptism represented in these pictures: "*Il rito del battesimo effigiato per poca immersione e simultanea infusione dell' acqua*" (the rite of baptism represented by slight immersion and simultaneous affusion of water). In his exposition of the subject he calls special attention to the "slight immersion of the boy and the affusion or aspersion of water upon his head and upon his body," and adds that the conception of the rite (*salutare lavacro*) in the Callistan pictures, and other monuments which he cites, "is principally expressed by the water sprinkled upon the head and upon the whole person."¹ And elsewhere he speaks of baptism by contemporaneous partial immersion and affusion of water upon the head and upon the person."² So when Martigny uses the phrase, "la simple immersion," he refers to standing in water, which in one of his pictures does not even cover the feet.³

Nor can anything more favorable to submersion, so far as we can discover, be derived from the learned and sometimes fanciful expositions of Garucci. He does, indeed, say that the lad (*giovanetto*) represented in Figure 3 is wholly immersed in a shower of water ("*immerso interamente in un nembro di acqua*"), but he immediately adds: "which bath is represented by great sprays of sea-green, thrown with the pencil around his [the lad's] person and even above his head. And thus baptism is represented." Baptism represented by sprays of water, even if suggestive of a shower of the same, is at most a symbolical immersion, and the moment symbolism is allowed in this matter a literal submersion is abandoned. Garucci's general position respecting the mode of baptism in the ancient church is, we judge, fairly shown by the following extract from the "*Teorica*": "Most ancient and especially established was the rite of immersing the person in the water, and three times the head also, while the ministrant pronounced the three names: it is not, however, to be believed that baptism never took place otherwise. Because when, for the occasion, either the amount of water requisite for immersion, or the capacity of the vessel, was insufficient, or when the condition of the

¹ *Rom. Sott.*, i. pp. 333, 334.

² *Bulletino di archeologia cristiana*, 1876, p. 12.

³ *Dictionnaire des antiq. chrét.*, pp. 82, 83.

catechumen was such that it would have been dangerous for him to be entirely plunged in the waters, or for some other weighty motive, there was a substitution of the baptism spoken of as that of Infusion or Aspersión, by pouring or sprinkling the water on the head of him who was receiving baptism, while he stood either within a vessel which did not suffice to admit him wholly, or outside of this and upon the dry ground."¹

Symbolically, however, there is no doubt that the original conception of baptism implied that the whole person was the subject of the purifying rite, and therefore it was natural and fitting, and doubtless was the primitive and ordinary practice, to apply the water to the entire body.² When, somewhat later in the century in which these frescoes were painted, Cyprian expressed his approval of clinic baptism by sprinkling, he uses the expressive and instructive phrase, "the divine abridgments," (*compendia*),³ meaning that any less total use of water than immersion is an abridgment of the full rite, though equally effective when sufficient reason exists for such curtailment. The representation in art of the candidate as standing in water is doubtless part of the symbolism which is more fully expressed in literal immersion, but which for good reason may be sufficiently expressed, even though only the head be sprinkled.

¹ "Antichissimo e solenne fu il rito d'immergere la persona nell' acqua, e tre volte anche il capo, al pronunziare del ministro i tre nomi: non è pertanto da credere che altrimenti non si battezzasse giammai. Perocchè mancando al bisogna o la copia di acqua richiesta all'immersione, o la capacità della vasca, ovvero essendo la condizione del catecumeno tale che gli fosse pericoloso il tuffarsi interamente nelle acque, ovvero per alcun altro grave motivo supplivasi col battesimo detto di infusione od aspersione, versando o spargendo l'acqua sul capo di colui che si battezzava, stando egli or dentro una vasca che non bastava a riceverlo tutto, o fuori di essa e sulla terra asciutta." *Op. cit.* i. 27, 28.

² The offices of the Syrian church of Jerusalem illustrate this conception, and all the more so because they appoint affusion as the mode. The priest, as directed, first lets the candidate down into the baptistery. Then laying his right hand on the head of the person to be baptized, with his left hand he takes up water successively from before, behind, and from each side of the candidate, and pours it upon his head, and washes his whole body ("funditque super caput ejus, et abluit totum ipsius corpus"). See Chrystal's *History of the Modes of Christian Baptism*, p. 123 *et seq.* So in Cyprian's letter to Magnus the form of the question proposed is, whether those "who obtain God's grace in infirmity and languor are to be accounted legitimate Christians because they have not been bathed [immersed or plunged], but thoroughly besprinkled (*perfusi*) with the saving water."

³ The word is mistranslated in Clark's *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, vol. viii. p. 311.

But these early pictures of affusion do not stand alone in early Christian art. Their testimony to the freedom of believers in the use of this sacred rite is perpetuated by a chain of witnesses running down through the centuries.

On the frieze of the sarcophagus of Junius Bassus, who died A. D. 359, a lamb lays his foot on the head of another lamb, while a stream of water descends from the beak of a dove.¹

About the same date Christian families were living on the Esquiline, of whom numerous traces were discovered only a few years ago (1876), and among these the fragment of a glass cup, which is represented in full size in Figure 4.² A young girl stands un-



FIGURE 4.

der a stream of water flowing from an inverted vase hanging by a garland. A dove, with an olive-branch in its beak, is descending upon her head, on which rests the hand of a lost figure. On the right of the neophyte in the Figure — the design was to be seen by looking into the cup and through its walls, and the en-

¹ See the engraving in Northcote and Brownlow's *Rom. Sott.*, ii. p. 261, or Martigny, *Op. cit.* p. 27.

² Figures 4 and 5 are copied from a Plate in De Rossi's *Bulletin Fasc. 1*, 1876. In the first and second *Fasciculi* for that year are explanatory articles. Cf. Martigny, *Op. cit.* p. 82. Schulze (*Arch. Stud.*, p. 58) dates these figures near the close of the third century. This is probably a misprint. They belong to the latter part of the fourth or beginning of the fifth.

graving shows it reversed — is a priest, named Mirax, in tunic and pallium, and with a halo in its simplest, perhaps earliest, form, a mark of dignity, not of sainthood. He appears to be looking in the same direction as the girl, and to be speaking of her, as indicated by his gesture. She is clothed in the white garment worn by newly-baptized persons, and its folds and the action of the right arm and hand indicate that the right knee is bent and raised as if she were ascending the steps to leave the font. Of her name remain only the letters Alba. Possibly it was Albana. The natural supposition is that the priest is presenting her, at the completion of the rite, to her parents and friends. The hand upon her

head may be that of a sponsor. The glass was engraved as a memorial of her baptism, and the designer combined in the representation actions which were not contemporaneous, but successive.

Figure 5 is from a marble found in Aquileja. A boy — as the presence of



FIGURE 5.

the godfather shows — stands in a basin or shallow font, under a sheet of water represented as falling from the starry skies, from which descends also the mystic dove. Around the design appears the inscription (not copied in our engraving): "To the innocent spirit whom the Lord has chosen. He rests in peace, a believer, the tenth day before the kalends of September."¹ It is a memorial of a child who had died soon after baptism.

In another much later, though ancient representation, — a bas-relief from Monza, — a dove holds in its beak a vase reversed, from which the water descends on the head of Jesus. Sometimes, as in the bas-relief already referred to, — that of Junius Bassus, — the water flows directly from the dove. Such a design appears in an enameled silver spoon from the fourth century, — perhaps the first half, — of which Martigny gives an engraving. The boy stands in a basin, and the only water represented descends from the dove.

¹ "Innocenti spo quem elegit Dñs pausat in pace fidelis X Kal Septembres." "Sept" is repeated.

Additional examples are cited by De Rossi and others. The association of representations of affusion with the familiar objects of household life as well as with the diptych of the metropolitan church of Milan, with elaborately carved sarcophagi or other marbles, with church mosaics, the altar-piece of St. Ambrose, etc., would seem to indicate how accustomed the minds of men were to other conceptions of baptism than that of dipping or plunging.

Of mosaics, two in Ravenna are specially noteworthy. One, Figure 6, is usually referred to about A. D. 450. The original can still be seen in the Ursian Baptistery, "S. Giovanni in Fonte."



FIGURE 6.

On the right of our Lord, who stands in the Jordan with the water up to the waist, is seen the Baptist standing on a rock projecting from the bank, and bending a little forward as he pours water upon the head of Christ from a shell which he holds in his right hand, while his left grasps a jeweled cross (*crux gemmata*). The dove is represented as in direct descent. On the left

is the river-god Jordan. Portions of the mosaic may have been changed by "restorations," but the original design is unchanged.¹

The other mosaic to which we have referred is in the ancient Arian Baptistery, now called "S. Maria in Cosmedin," and is about a century later (c. A. D. 553). It treats of the same subject — the Baptism in the Jordan, — and in a similar way.



FIGURE 7.

Richter calls attention to the youthful appearance of Christ in this mosaic, and says that it is almost boyish, and unlike any other kindred representation. But the general method of early Christian art in other departments — frescoes, bas-reliefs, etc. — is the same. Sometimes, as in a marble of which Roller gives an engraving taken from a photograph,² Jesus appears as a mere youth, a symbol for reciprocity and humility.³ These two mosaics thus perpetuate the main elements of the representations given in the Catacombs centuries earlier.

We will not follow the history further down. The later repre-

¹ *Mosaiken von Ravenna*, p. 11 (Wien, 1878). The meaning of the letters I X I N is not known; Garucci suggests *Iesus Christus justificat nos*, or *justificatio nostra*, or *illuminatio nostra*. ² *Op. cit.* ii. 143, Pl. lxxvii., 3.

³ In this bas-relief the water falls in two streams from an elevated rock. Jesus kneels in the larger stream, while the other falls upon his head, and also into a vase which the Baptist holds as if to complete the rite by affusion.

sentations are tolerably familiar by frequent reproductions, and enough has been adduced for the purpose of showing a steady tradition of Christian liberty as to the mode of baptism.

The fact offers several important suggestions in connection with present discussions.

It illustrates the naturalness, and so has a bearing upon the antiquity, of the recently discovered "Teaching of the Apostles."

We might expect that a tradition so established in Art would find literary expression. And we have seen that the absence of such evidence before the middle of the third century has in fact led one distinguished archæologist to do violence to the text of the mural decorations of the Catacombs, as traditional assumptions have led theologians to do violence to the text of Sacred Scripture. This, in our judgment, is pressing the argument from silence too far. But, however this may be, when a document now appears affirming, with a manifest consciousness of fidelity to apostolic principles, — the gospel of the Lord, — the admissibility of a baptism which is not dipping, but pouring, it is easy to see that we simply have appearing in literature what the testimony of Art prepares us to receive. In fact, there is a double advantage. The "Teaching" helps to a natural interpretation of the pictures, and the pictures strengthen the impression of naturalness which is so marked a feature of the "Teaching." And if the representations in Art show a wider range of variation than does the "Teaching," this does not impair the force of what has been said. In both cases alike the fact is clear that baptism — the rite, and not merely the word — did not mean to the early Christians exclusively sacramental submersion or dipping. Pouring, to Egyptian Christians, or wherever the "Teaching" was written, might also be baptism. Pouring, to Roman Christians, with partial immersion — perhaps without it — was also baptism. The two testimonies concur at the point of Christian liberty. And this brings us to an exceedingly practical and important question.

A large body of Christians devoted to our common Lord, zealous in good works, decline fellowship in sacraments and church membership with their fellow believers because of alleged defect in the mode of administering baptism. This position is taken under a conviction of obligation to adhere rigidly to what are deemed the instructions of our Lord and his apostles. These instructions, of course, are found in the New Testament. They rest on interpretation. And as this has to do with the usage of words and historic facts, Baptist scholars have studied with utmost painstaking the pa-

tristic and other testimonies from the ancient Church. We think that the strength of their position in the historic field has not been duly appreciated by many of their opponents. The ordinary practice in the church, we cannot doubt, was in principle very much what the "Teaching" indicates; that is, the regular, ordinary mode, the full realization of the symbolism of the rite, required submersion or a complete covering with water. And Baptist scholars have fairly pressed this fact in support of their argument as to the apostolic practice. Words did not wholly change their meaning in passing from the first century to the second and third centuries. Neither did rites entirely lose their substance. It is right and proper to argue back, therefore, from language and usages in the later time to what was instituted in the apostolic age. If immersion was the only recognized mode in the time of Tertullian and his contemporaries, and there is no evidence of change in language or practice in the intervening years, we may fairly presume that it was the only mode in the apostolic age. If "baptize" means "dip" solely in church administration, it meant "dip" as uttered by our Lord, and, as we have said, looking at church usage and patristic testimony, the Baptists, in our judgment, have had the best of the argument, so far as historic fact merely is involved.

But the case, even within this narrow sphere of reasoning, is now much changed. Archaeology is no longer a matter of guesswork. It has taken up the principles and methods of science. It has established facts pertinent to this question which are beyond reasonable doubt. And it shows a tradition of liberty, a consciousness of right of variation in mode, which makes it impossible to understand the historic fact any longer as before. Submersion was not the only recognized mode. Baptism did not mean sacramental dipping, plunging, or covering with water exclusively. A person affused or partially covered with water was baptized — other conditions of the rite being duly regarded. So the monuments unmistakably testify. Now comes in the "Teaching," carrying the evidence of liberty of variation back close upon, if not into, the apostolic age itself. It will not do to repudiate such testimony and fall back simply on the New Testament. It is a question of the meaning of the New Testament. And if, as all Baptist scholars have done indefatigably, it was right to use sub-apostolic and later testimony when it favored immersion as the only mode, it cannot be wrong to use it when it disfavors immersion. If it was fair to press it before, it cannot be fair to ignore it now.

The question, as we have said, is a very serious and wide-reaching one. It affects the work of missions at home and abroad. It is a painful spectacle to see Christians separated from each other, disunited and in conflict over the very sacraments of their faith, in the face of heathenism in China and India, or at home in the face of indifference, doubt, and unbelief. Never was there greater opportunity for effective Christian work. Never, therefore, was everything that divides and hinders so much to be deprecated, so much to be searched out and destroyed. Nor will it be questioned, we presume, by any one that it is essentially schismatic for a church to set up, as a universal and indispensable condition of participation in the sacraments, an administration of them which is not plainly enjoined. It is not divisive to obey the New Testament. It is not failing in Christian coöperation to adhere to a divine command. But it is incumbent not to withhold divine sacraments from any to whom they belong, not to set up our own understanding of God's Word as a bar to Christian fellowship in ordinance and aggressive work, so long as there is a reasonable doubt whether our interpretation does not impose more than the Lord himself requires. And this, as we see the matter, is precisely the problem which the Providence of God in the discovery of this new document and in other ways, at this time when Christians are pressed and burdened with the painful sense of their divisions, brings to those who have insisted upon immersion as the only admissible form of baptism. With increased light comes augmented responsibility. We do not presume to judge as to their duty. We do not claim that the new evidence decides the question as to the mode actually practiced by the apostles. Still less that it determines what is the preferable mode, or the one that is most expressive and effective in its symbolism. We have no doubt ourselves that immersion has been practiced from the beginning. It may continue to be observed to the end. Our sole contention — or rather the question we would in all kindness and love of Christian unity and coöperation respectfully submit — is simply this: Is it possible to justify the maintenance of the doctrine that baptism, in order to be baptism, must always and everywhere be administered by submersion without a "Thus saith the Lord," which, if ever spoken, would have made impossible the seventh chapter of the "Teaching" and the further revelation of the church's consciousness of liberty in the early representations of baptism in Christian art?

Egbert C. Smyth.

EDITORIAL.

THE RESPONSE TO THE NEW CREED.

THE response, while not a unanimous, is a general and hearty Amen. The relative number of those who disapprove appears to correspond with the proportion of dissent on the part of the Commission. It is not more than two in twenty-four. The weight properly belonging to adverse opinion is not, of course, as easily estimated. But more than a month of discussion shows beyond question that the Congregational denomination, as at whole, warmly approves the new statement of doctrine. Sober second thought has confirmed the first favorable impression. It was expected that there would be sincere and earnest objection. No gift of prophecy was needed to foresee that some conscientious and eminent Congregationalists would be disappointed. They certainly are not to be blamed for expressing their dissatisfaction with the result. If they had been satisfied, however, an overwhelming majority would not have been, and with equally good reason.

We have been too recently reminded of the unsoundness of the majority to accept popular verdicts as decisive. In evil times the remnant, not the multitude, is on the side of truth. Also, in matters of faith, as Luther used to declare, one should believe so as to be able to say Yes, even if all the world says No. Religious convictions cannot be controlled by a show of hands. But the value of a popular verdict depends on the kind of multitude from which it proceeds, and also on the kind of question with which that multitude deals. It would be absurd to say that the emphatic endorsement of this weighty document by the great body of Congregational clergymen and laymen is not in itself profoundly significant. In this case the Christian consciousness is to be trusted. Such a response from such a source could not be elicited by a statement dangerously erroneous in its utterances or fatally defective in its silences.

It may also be affirmed that if the creed were merely or chiefly a compromise it would have gained no such response. Indefiniteness and silence can do no more than to obviate hostile criticism. In such matters approval can be secured only by positive and clear declarations. That the character of the framers of the creed has had some influence on those to whom the creed was offered cannot be doubted. But the confidence inspired lay in the certainty that such men would never present a mere compromise as the result of their consultations. That the confidence was not misplaced is demonstrated by an article in the "Independent" of April 10th, from Professor Fisher, who was a member of the Commission. The article has unusual value both as showing that there were cogent reasons for every doctrinal statement, and also as showing his

own opinions on certain theological questions. It seems that Dr. Alden has printed the creed with such additions as he considered indispensable. Professor Fisher takes these up one after another to explain why they were not incorporated in the creed of the Commission. Convincing reasons are given for adhering to the phraseology of the Nicene Creed respecting the Trinity, and for omitting the words "vicarious" and "expiatory" from the article on Atonement. But most significant of all is that which Professor Fisher says concerning the Bible and the final judgment. The Bible was not declared to be an *infallible* record, for the excellent reason that the vast majority of scholars believe that it is not. If the record is infallible, "it would compel every one to explain the inconsistent chronological and other numerical statements in Kings and Chronicles by referring them all to a corruption of the original text, an assumption which, in the opinion of numerous judicious scholars, would shake our confidence in the authenticity of the Scriptures to such an extent as to imperil the foundation of the main doctrines of revelation." The Commission did not affirm that the issues of the last judgment "will be determined by the deeds done in the body," first, because the quotation as found in the Epistle to the Corinthians applies only to those who have embraced the gospel, — ministers and professing Christians, — and also because there were good reasons for rejecting the proposition itself. "The old Protestant view adopted by the Reformers (except Zwingli), that all the heathen and unbaptized infants perish, is no longer held. The Calvinistic doctrine that only elect infants are saved has gone by. Leading theologians of Germany in recent times have adopted the opinion that those who have not heard the gospel, and therefore have not rejected it, or at least that certain classes of such, have the opportunity given them beyond the grave of accepting Christ as a Saviour. This opinion of late has spread somewhat in England and in this country. . . . Most of the Commission judged that these are questions to be thought out and fought out in the schools, as Dr. Newman would say — independently of all pronunciamentos. They judged it best to confine themselves to the customary statements on the subject of future punishment." If any one believed that the Commission proceeded on a basis of compromise in essentials, this unqualified statement must convert him to another opinion.

It was a work of supererogation for the Secretary of the Commission to testify that the proceedings were characterized throughout by fairness and freedom, for every honorable man took that for granted.

Some are gratified, as was predicted in the April number of the Review, to make the discovery that adherents of the new theology believe so much. Dr. Hodge, writing in the "Presbyterian Review," is relieved and delighted to find that the new departure accepts as much evangelical doctrine as is embodied in this creed, and the same feeling has found expression in other quarters. It seems to have been thought

that those who are identified with the new movement in theology are in their opinions little better than infidels, and in their influence a great deal worse. In a period of suspicion, misunderstanding and even misrepresentation are unavoidable. Those who suffer must bide their time with patience. Even the sanctified human nature of Christian controversialists is not absolutely free from prejudice. But may not those who have been doggedly misrepresented claim the simple right, in view of their honest acceptance of this creed, to be dealt with as of the household of faith? While we do not profess to be in the secrets of any new movement, or to be the representatives of any party, new or old, but only to maintain that which we ourselves believe, we do venture the assertion that what is called the new movement in theology is grounded in sympathy rather than opinion. There are wide differences of doctrinal belief among those who are characterized as adherents of the new theology. The bond that unites them is the bond of sympathy. Together they contend for candid investigation of truth. They are one in seeking to find the sources of spiritual life and power in God's revelation of redemption. They know each other by a spiritual rather than an intellectual instinct. It will be no strange thing if those who are most vitally identified with this living tendency are found to be more in accord with the ancient evangelical faith of the church than those who are swiftest to accuse them of heresy. It is not unlikely that their thought of the great doctrines of the Person of Christ, of Sin, and of Atonement, and, back of all, of the Christian conception of God, will prove to reproduce those truths in a scriptural and spiritual integrity not found in the opinions for which orthodoxy is persistently claimed.

That is a shallow judgment of the creed and of its reception which thinks a "victory" has been gained for the new theology or for any party. The new creed and the new impulse in religious thought and life are results of the same causes; the rising tide which cannot be pushed back is beneath them alike. Such a creed with its cordial welcome can be a victory for the new theology only in the sense that, by its practical agreement with the new tendencies, it shows in how broad and deep a current they really flow. It is sheer ignorance which asserts that certain men are introducing new views, are causing unrest, are disturbing those who would gladly be let alone in the faith of their fathers. They are merely expressing and explaining the deeper conceptions of spiritual truth which are taking possession of the churches. The creed does the very same thing. The new theology did not produce the new creed, for both are borne along on the same deep under-currents. Least of all should the creed be condemned because it is satisfactory to the friends of progressiveness in religious thinking. It is too late in the day to decide on important matters by calling names.

The creed meets a hearty response, but let us not therefore set too high a value on that which is only a statement. It is but a *credo* after

all. It only formulates what the mass of evangelical Christians already believe. Its uses are limited by the very fact that it is a creed. It has not even the authority which their creeds have for other great bodies of believers. It is an index of the best religious thought of an untrammelled denomination. It merely summarizes the conclusions which have been reached by many minds thinking and working independently of each other in the one great kingdom of the Lord. As such it has no small value. But it is only indicative, not creative nor authoritative. It does not tell Christian men what they ought to believe nor what they must believe. It merely states what Christian men, looking honestly into each other's faces, do believe. It has its response because, for the most part, it says so well what the many had been believing, but what no one alone would have been able so adequately to express.

THE PERSONALITY OF A CITY: A LESSON FROM CINCINNATI.

THE causes of the riot at Cincinnati are now before the country. The impression has been made, through the explanations given, that the reasons were chiefly local. The immediate and moving cause was at once seen to be the failure of justice. But other causes, more remote and general, leading up to this, such as the location of the city on the southern border, the withdrawal of a large part of the native population into the suburbs, the steady concession and surrender of moral opinions and customs to the demands of the foreign element, and the political and religious, or irreligious, history of the city for the past generation, have been so fully set forth and emphasized that other cities, differently circumstanced and of different growths, have assumed, with more or less assurance, exemption from a like calamity. The press of other cities has not appropriated in a large way the lesson from Cincinnati. Just now the discussion has gone over into the question of how to handle mobs, — a question which cannot be too thoroughly considered, but which evidently is not the greatest, if it is the first, question demanding attention. The machinery for suppressing a riot must be at hand, and must be sure to work with precision, but better still the avoidance or removal of those things which incite the riotous spirit. Certainly a riot ought to be without grounds of moral support.

The following extract from a private letter, written by a gentleman of the highest authority, suggests the lesson which we wish to enforce while the public thought is turned toward Cincinnati: —

"Superficially, it has been for some years known here that a few unprincipled men at the bar have found their profit in bribing juries, or packing them, which is the same thing. This has been as notorious in civil as in criminal cases. Honorable men in the profession have had the humiliation again and again of having clients say to them, 'We are satisfied to be guided by you in our business, but if we are sued, we must employ so and so, who somehow have

a way of getting verdicts.' These men are, of course, part of the 'machine.' They 'set up' the conventions, put their own creatures in place about the Court House—are known to have power gained by unscrupulous rascality. They have often dictated the nomination of judges, or have been so feared by those desirous of remaining on the bench as to prevent real independence. The wretched election of judges by popular vote has had its part in the rotting process. All this came to a head in the Berner case, in which an atrocious murder of an employer by his hired men, confessed to have been planned and executed for the sake of robbing him, was found to be only 'manslaughter' by the jury. The indignation meeting was a sincere one, full of only honest wrath at the hideous perversion of the forms of law. I refused to join in the call for it, or to attend it, because I feared some bad result from the accumulated excitement. The attempted lynching of the prisoners on Friday night was by the less instructed, but still fairly intelligent and upright people who were at the meeting. The burning of the Court House on Saturday night was by the worse class who always come in to do the devil's work when better men have so far forgotten themselves as to open the door."

Nothing so arouses a community as the miscarriage of justice. Society will endure any corruption, even that of the ballot, more patiently than the corruption of the courts. But the department of justice, which in the present instance was first neglected, then corrupted, and finally violated, belongs to the organization of every city. Together with other well-known departments it makes up what may be called the personality of the city. Every city has such a personality, distinct from its business, distinct from its social and religious life, distinct from many of its permanent institutions. The city proper, the corporate city, is a living organism within the city at large, assuming the guardianship at every moment of property and education and morals and life. Good citizenship demands loyalty to this not ideal, but real and supreme personality. But judged by this test we have few good citizens. The best men are seldom good citizens. They add greatly to the reputation of the city at large through their character, their enterprise, their attainments; they add nothing to the security or honor of the city proper. The city at large reaps the advantage of their munificent benefactions; the city proper suffers from their indifference and want of respect. They decline to take part in the administration of its affairs, they evade its just requirements, as in jury duty, they neglect to attend the meetings which determine its elections. Hence a city not infrequently acquires a personality entirely at variance with the character of those who represent its social and business life. A city may be conspicuous at one and the same time for the integrity of its leading business houses and for the maladministration of its departments.

And the reason for this, as has been intimated, lies not only in the want of devotion to, but in the want of respect for, the city as a political entity. No political significance has been allowed to it at all comparable to that given to the state or even to the town. The whole attitude of

mind on the part of better men has been wrong. They have simply used the city. They have thought of it chiefly for its advantages. A metropolis is largely made up of people whose interests are not those of birth, but of ambition. They have been drawn thither for fortune or name. No inherited responsibilities rest upon them, and they do not readily conceive the idea of purely civic responsibilities and obligations. The average voter of the town is far more faithful to his political duties than the average voter of the city; and doubtless because the town has less to offer in the way of mere personal advantage. The country trains toward political duty through the absence of great personal opportunities; the city trains away from political duty, through the excess of personal opportunities.

There are, however, signs of a growing respect for the personality of the city, the city corporate. One sign is that its political life is beginning to appeal to the ambition of young men who have heretofore given themselves entirely to commercial or professional careers. Examples of young men like Mr. Lowe, of Brooklyn, and Mr. Roosevelt, of New York, are suggestive and hopeful. They are not afraid of "politics," nor of politicians. They lay their plans and pursue their end with a persistence and courage such as we should expect from them in business. They satisfy John Foster's idea of the type of goodness necessary to "make bad men uncomfortable,"—the "formidably active" type. We have had enough of "reform movements" and "reform tickets." Something deeper and more permanent is needed in municipal government. And the promise of this better thing is to be found in the response of young men native to a city and identified with its larger interests, as they give themselves to the practical study of the art of administration and to the practical work of political control.

Another sign is the growing agreement of the more earnest citizens about methods of administration, specially when moral issues are concerned. The city has been the battle-field on which legislators have fought for contending theories. The temperance issue has suffered peculiarly in the city from frequent changes of policy. The advocates of one method have looked on with indifference and contempt while the other method has been on trial. But in this, and in other issues of a moral bearing, men are slowly learning that it is best to "take the strength" out of the existing law, whatever it may be. An incomplete and insufficient enactment, fully executed is seen to lead up to the better law. The educating force of Law and Order Leagues toward good laws cannot be overestimated, and these leagues are training-schools in citizenship.

And still another sign is to be seen in the growing purpose to separate the administration of the city from party politics. The necessity for this separation is becoming apparent to the whole country. Doubtless more than one presidential election has been affected by the trade between

politicians of the city of New York against the State. The danger from the spoils system is seen to be more imminent and more uncontrollable in the city than elsewhere. The mob element lies close at hand ready to take advantage of any popular dissatisfaction, of any expression of spasmodic justice. Let us not forget the order of events at Cincinnati. The crowd which attempted the lynching of the prisoners on Friday night was made up of the "less instructed, but still of fairly intelligent and upright people." The mob which burned the Court House on Saturday night was made up of the "worse class which always comes in to do the devil's work when better men have so far forgotten themselves as to open the door." It is the terrible earnestness of men acting under the sense of injustice and corruption which "opens the door" to violence. The mob element, which is becoming a permanent factor of the city, is not of itself necessarily dangerous. The mob which originates purely in the mob spirit can be quickly controlled under an efficient police system. The real danger lies in that neglect of duty on the part of citizens through which corruption comes in, and for which there may seem to be no remedy except through violent methods. Distribute the earnestness which finds vent in occasional reforms and revolutions into duty, and the danger is averted. When the safety of the city is put first in the daily thoughts of all good citizens, the city is safe. When the honor of the city is sufficiently regarded, the city is honorable in the eyes of all men. The lesson from Cincinnati is a lesson touching the sacredness and worth of the city in its corporate personality.

DR. EZRA ABBOT.

THE sketches of the late Dr. Ezra Abbot, written for one of our leading religious journals by two of his friends and collaborators, show in a very striking way his rare gifts and attainments, and perhaps rarer moral qualities. Besides accrediting him with abilities and acquisitions which put him at the head of our biblical scholars, they reveal a surprising unselfishness in disposing of the results of his work. Professor Thayer assigns as a reason for his not leaving "such a memorial . . . of his wholly exceptional gifts and attainments as his friends had a right to expect," the fact that, "Few men have been more appealed to than he for information and counsel. He gave gratuitously and unsparingly to all. As was recently remarked by a friend, 'He has spent his life in reading other people's proof-sheets.'" This tribute excites an admiration for the man warmer even than that felt for the scholar. The beneficence which gives time, talent, and strength which would surely yield fame is far finer than that which bestows money. The generosity of our "great givers" pales before that of a man of whom President Woolsey could say, "he surpassed all men whom I ever knew in his readiness to serve others who had but few books on hand and did not know where to look for in-

formation. Dr. Abbot was not only willing to give advice to persons consulting him, but to a great extent by personal labor, when he was full of work of his own, he saved to authors preparing their books a multitude of hours by spending his own much needed time in their service." The other qualities ascribed to Dr. Abbot by these friendly but discriminating critics complete the picture of a Christian scholar. The high intellectual qualities, the tenacious memory, the balance of judgment, the critical sagacity rested upon a moral basis. His "honesty of desire to find out the truth," says Dr. Woolsey, "shows a basis of uprightness which insured to him high confidence and respect." The great deference which his associates of the New Testament Revision Committee paid to his judgment in matters of textual criticism was a tribute to his candor no less than to his superior knowledge. Theological partisanship — indeed partisanship of any kind — seemed impossible to him. Such an illustration of the noblest type of the scholarly life, in its high integrity and quiet unselfishness, has perhaps not been given by any life completed among us since the untimely death of Prof. James Hadley, of Yale College. There is a marked similarity between the two men, with strong points of contrast. Both left an impression of consummate scholarship not shown in any single achievement. Both possessed in an eminent degree the judicial temper which characterizes the first order of mind. Both were gifted with remarkable tenacity of memory. Here the resemblance ceases. Professor Hadley was more versatile, but paid the penalty of his versatility by not attaining in any one department the preëminence which Dr. Abbot held in textual criticism.

It is scarcely necessary to point out the supreme value which such a life as Dr. Abbot's has in reminding the church that the distinctively Christian virtues may be as fully exemplified in the character and career of its scholars as of its missionaries or reformers, and so helping to correct the tendency to find in the "Christian worker" the one ideal of excellence. But it is perhaps worth while to emphasize the fact that Dr. Abbot's supremacy as a scholar was in that class of studies the pursuit of which is in some quarters thought to be prejudicial to, if not incompatible with, the development of the religious life. He was above all things a biblical critic. "In discussions on the meaning of the passages before the company," says Dr. Woolsey, "he was more on an equality with the others; yet no one surpassed him. All deferred to his judgment," as has been said, "with regard to questions of textual criticism." His critical gift found its fullest employment in this department, but it was freely exercised upon the contents as well as the language of the New Testament. His essay upon the authorship of the fourth Gospel, the most important treatise which he has left behind, is the best illustration of biblical criticism which American sacred literature affords. The question at issue, so vital to religious interests, is discussed in a thoroughly judicial temper. The evidence is as calmly weighed as if the

claims of what purported to be a poem by Horace or an oration by Cicero were under consideration. There is something judicial even in the single touch of sarcasm, "Individuals differ widely in their power of resisting evidence opposed to their prejudices, and the author of 'Supernatural Religion' has few equals in this capacity." Such criticism shows in every calm word its conviction of the rightfulness, not of its conclusions only, but of its method. Its firm tone always expresses the consciousness of going to work in the right way to seek the truth. Its impression of fairness is due to its conceding the justice of the principles on which its opponents are proceeding. It is always saying, "you are right in assuming that this is a historical question, to be settled upon historical grounds. Let us see whither the facts will lead us."

It is not a rationalist who thus calmly claims the right to apply critical processes to the most precious portion of the New Testament. Dr. Abbot was a devout Christian from his youth. Those who recall his student life at Bowdoin College remember him as attending the Sunday morning prayer-meeting, and leading it when his turn came, reading out of his Greek Testament the lesson of the hour. His friends of later years testify to the impression of piety which he made upon them. President Woolsey writes, "I claim no especial intimacy with him, as it regards his higher feelings and deeper faith. I have supposed him to be in his Christology an Arian; but he has said some things in regard to his feelings — short simple utterances — which implied to me a faith in Christ, the Saviour of the world, and an endeavor to do God's will, which seemed to be susceptible of no other interpretation than that he had sought and found God, and as such I regard him." Says Professor Thayer, "No one ever privileged to associate much with Ezra Abbot will need to be told that he was one of the most sincere and humble disciples of Jesus. Every one who knew him well, and who himself cherishes aspirations after heaven, will hope to meet him there. . . . I often noticed how naturally his thoughts gravitated — or rather ascended — to the loftiest themes, with what evident satisfaction he would speak of the spiritual refreshment given him by some recent sermon of his fervent young pastor. The deep undercurrent of his soul set toward that blessed shore, on which his feet now stand." Did Dr. Abbot then do violence to the deeper impulses of his nature in prosecuting biblical criticism? Was it in violation of his better feelings that he assumed the validity of the historical method in ascertaining the authorship of the fourth Gospel? Would he have been a better Christian if he had been a less eminent critic? Would one who loved him and who knew the effect his favorite pursuit was having upon his character have wished that he might abandon it, to engage in "studies which warm the heart"? If so, the calmness with which a judge sums up the evidence in a trial for murder shows an icy heart. No one, not blinded by religious prejudice, can help seeing that Dr. Abbot's moral qualities alone enabled him to discuss questions in which

he was deeply interested without passion. The interests of religion and of truth demanded that the Scriptures should be treated as a historical product with candor and thoroughness; he gave his best energies and highest gifts to the work; he served the church nobly in doing it, and receives her grateful acknowledgment for his services and her praise for the lofty spirit in and out of which they were rendered. May those who join in paying honor to his memory be consistent enough cheerfully to concede to biblical science its rights on the critical as well as on the constructive side; and at least allow the name of Christian workmen to those who with less shining gifts are following in his footsteps!

"SATISFACTORY, BUT —."

CONGREGATIONAL ecclesiastical councils, called to ordain or install, have long been accustomed to vote upon the motion "that the examination of the candidate be deemed satisfactory, and that the council proceed to ordain or install." Of late we hear occasionally of proposals to substitute for this time-honored formula one which conveys more or less of dissent from particular opinions which the candidate has expressed during the examination. The forms of modification vary, but phrases like the following are sufficiently exact to illustrate the method proposed: "*Voted*, That the council deems the examination *so far* satisfactory that it will proceed to ordain (or install)." Or, "*Voted*, That the examination be deemed satisfactory, and that we proceed, etc.; *but* we desire to place on record our dissent," etc.; or, "we commend to the candidate a careful re-examination of," etc.; or, "*Resolved* (1), That we proceed, etc.; (2), that in so doing we express no approval of the opinion," etc. Usually such proposals are rejected; but now and then they appear in the "Result." To our apprehension they are offered on a misunderstanding of the meaning of the usual formula, "*Voted*, That the examination be deemed satisfactory." It may be best to change the formula, so that the usual motion will simply be to proceed with the services of ordination or installation. Yet after a careful and sometimes protracted examination has been held, and this fact duly entered on the records of the council, it is natural and fitting that the result should be definitely stated as the basis of the subsequent action; and we know of no better formula for this purpose than the customary one. What does it mean?

The theory of the action of a council in such cases is a very simple and obvious one. The council meets to advise the church whether or not it can have fellowship with it in its choice of A. B. as its pastor; and, as involved in this, whether it can fellowship the candidate. The real question before it is always at bottom one of ecclesiastical fellowship. And this is not a matter of "ifs" and "buts," of "so far as" and "while we," etc. Fellowship is always either given or withheld. The only effective act is the ordaining or installing act. If this is performed, no

qualifications or resolutions appended affect its completeness in the least. A pastor ordained by a council is received into its full fellowship, has all the rights and standing a council can bestow, and no one can question his presence and powers in any ecclesiastical convocation because of any "riders" which may have been appended to the council's vote. The vote is a mere matter of words save as expressed in act. It is therefore a stultification and absurdity to append these "ifs" and "buts." It is like saying, "I will do this, if or but," and then doing it without any regard to the expressed condition — a procedure which in any important matter in private life would impair confidence either in the sense or the integrity of any person so conducting himself. If councils wish to retain the respect of men, they cannot afford to impeach in words a religious teacher whom, in act, they immediately proceed to recognize and fellowship in this very capacity.

The word "satisfactory," in the ordinary formula, means, and only can mean, that the council discovers by the examination that there is the requisite basis for fellowship. Either this is found, or it is not; and the record should agree with the fact.

We say that it cannot signify more than this. We mean that it cannot so long as councils are fairly chosen and the qualities characteristic of Congregational churches and ministers remain. It might be possible, by picking a council and keeping it conveniently small, to bring together men who either would not know their own minds well enough, or would not possess sufficient intelligence and mental activity to withhold them from expressing agreement with the candidate in all his utterances. But we have never known such a council. Or there may arise such a candidate that he would grace a chair of infallibility; but an American Congregational council has not yet seen his like. Noah Webster could not write a dictionary without expressing in his definitions a preference of cranberry-sauce to apple-sauce. We doubt whether, if even in so obvious a matter he should make this declaration before a church full of Congregationalists, or before a council not picked more carefully than either cranberries or apples ever are, his opinion would be deemed by all "satisfactory." It is impossible that an examination ever should be pronounced satisfactory, if by this is meant that every member of the council indorses every doctrinal or ecclesiastical position taken by the candidate. One man holds that God is governing the world by two systems, one for Christians, another for heathen; another believes that such a dualism is contrary to the nature of God and the absoluteness of Christianity. Whichever position is taken by the candidate, somebody is not satisfied. But the examination shows that the candidate will preach to all whom he can reach: "There is none other name," and the man holding one opinion and the man holding the opposite may be alike satisfied that this preaching is sound and salutary, and that they can fellowship the preacher and the church in giving and receiving such truth. They

vote, therefore, that the examination is "satisfactory," though one or the other must be dissatisfied with the candidate's opinions as to the salvation of the heathen. So one man believes that the satisfaction theory of the atonement requires its limitation to the elect; another, that the governmental theory leaves out of account God's essential righteousness; another, that the manifestation theory fails to recognize anything to be manifested, and each is pretty sure to have his turn of being profoundly dissatisfied, if he attends a sufficient and probably not very large number of councils. But each, in every case, may find that the candidate puts at the basis of every offer of divine forgiveness, and into every penitent and believing Christian life, as its fountain, the sacrifice offered on Calvary. And so each can vote in every case, notwithstanding his particular dissatisfaction, that the examination is "satisfactory," meaning by this that he is ready to fellowship the man who thus preaches and the church that chooses him as its pastor.

We conceive that wrong is done to a candidate when a council votes to fellowship him, and at the same time condemns some of his opinions. He is set over a people to be its religious teacher by solemn act of council, and then the council says to the people: "Look out or he will lead you astray." That is, the kiss of fellowship is also the sign of betrayal.

Wrong is equally done, as we have already intimated, to the good name and influence of councils. They are a salutary conservative power. With the multiplied tendencies which exist to an independence which is heedless of common obligations and rights, it is important to maintain their position in public confidence. But this cannot be secured by doing a thing and at the same time doing something at variance with it.

Nor can any interests of truth be thus conserved. No honor is done to any doctrine by putting it into a minor resolution when the major one receives into full fellowship the person who declines to accept it. It may well be that this man or that advances opinions which will not stand the test of time and experience, that one or another fails to appreciate the value of this mode or that of stating a particular doctrine. It may be that friendly counsel, intercourse with his brethren in the ministry, will conduct such an one farther along the pathway of truth than he has yet advanced. And it may also be that some young man may be wiser than all his teachers or examiners, and have something to give which they have not yet found. And however this may be, the proper method of promoting the maintenance and progress of truth is not a deliverance which is impaired and probably nullified by an inconsistent or disparaging act. Ordaining councils are not commissions charged with the office of framing creeds. They have another function. If they find a man worthy of fellowship, it is their duty to give it; if unworthy, to withhold it. Anything other or beyond belongs to other organizations and occasions. There are abundant and more fitting opportunities for counsel, admonition, discussion, or whatever may be of service in the defense and advancement of the faith of the Church.

ARCHÆOLOGICAL NOTES.

NEXT to seeing with one's eyes the very soil of ancient Babylonia, we must rank the life-like reproduction of its wonderful monuments. Such is the "Bronze Ornaments of the Palace Gates of Balawat," published by the Society of Biblical Archæology and contained in the library of Harvard University. The band of bronze, "looking like a gigantic hat-rack," when found in 1877 by Mr. Rassam and, when cleaned by Mr. Ready, recognized to be enormous folding gates twenty-one to twenty-six feet in height, and six feet each in width, are there taken as by a photographer. The green color of the bronze is perfect. In chased work are double tiers of pictures recording the campaigns of Shalmaneser II. 859-825 B. C.

To survey the four parts of the publication is to come in contact with the wide range of Assyrian life less than two centuries after Solomon. One plate represents an attack on a city in the country of Hamath and the fight of the enemy outside the gates. The low, unwieldy battering-ram is lunging viciously against the walls, and captives, with tied hands, are driven in a mournful drove by a eunuch on horseback. Another city with towers is bursting into flames, and burly, bearded soldiers, in scale-armor, from under trees watch the progress of the destroying element. Here fugitives are grasped by the hair and decapitated with the sword. There heads lie in heaps like those of Ahab's seventy sons, or, handless, footless bodies are impaled on stakes. One series of plates begins with a camp in which a eunuch is sentinel and two men are engaged in domestic work, it may be kneading bread, within a royal tent. Farther on we see an army crossing the Armenian mountains. The exertions of the charioteers to get the horses over the rugged paths are shown sometimes by their taking hold of the wheel, sometimes by their tugging at the bridle. At last the sea of Nairi, that is, Lake Van, appears, figured like a river, where the king stands with eunuchs and musicians. A high tripod is before him. He holds a tilted cup, from which he pours a libation. Oxen and sheep in droves stand meekly waiting the sacrifice. Grotesque creatures of the lake put forth their heads claiming their share of the feast.

Still another series shows a procession to the sources of the Tigris and the process of carving the royal image on a rock like that of the Nahr el Kelb at Beirut. Another represents the people of Carchemish bringing tribute, and reminds us of the black obelisk of Nimrud. The monarch stands before his pavilion. A brilliant body-guard attends him. The bow is in his hand. And the conquered file before the conqueror, bearing wine, aromatic woods, gold, precious stones, and driving sheep, oxen, spirited horses, the two-humped Bactrian camel, quite as we should expect from the inscriptions. It is touching in the captive train to see women and children walking before the men, their bodies bare, their faces sad, though their necks are not, like those of the men, tied with rope or notched in a stick by the long-robed guard. This very interesting and valuable collection of pictures is edited with an introduction by Dr. Samuel Birch, and contains descriptions and translations by Theophilus G. Pinches.

Our readers will perhaps recall our references in the January number of the Review to a series of articles, seven in number, on the "Importance of Assyriology to Hebrew Lexicography," published in the *Athenæum* by Friedrich Delitzsch, Professor of Assyriology at the University of Leipzig. Many will be glad to have them reprinted and revised in a little volume of seventy-one pages. The name of the book is "The Hebrew Language viewed in the light of Assyrian research." In the preface the author disclaims two things. One is attempting to explain *everything* by Assyrian. The other is unjust warfare on his part against the ninth edition of Gesenius's Dictionary. In the latter case he limits his censure to points where the editors have erroneously deviated from the correct views of Gesenius himself, or have failed to recognize what Fürst and Levy had already anticipated. The worth of Dr. Delitzsch's little work is in inverse proportion to its size. Accuracy, erudition, and enthusiasm mark its contents as a whole, and make them of singular fascination and value for Old Testament interpretation. The April number of the *Bibliotheca Sacra* gives an admirable view of it. We have space only for a single sample of its affluent materials, drawn from page fifty-five.

"The Hebrew and Assyrian *šar*, *šarru*, 'prince,' 'king,' exhibits the same primary signification. The Hebrew word is usually derived from a supposed stem, *šharar*, 'to govern,' this meaning being obtained by the assumption that 'to govern' is literally 'to divide,' or, rather, 'to dispose,' the root being *sar*, 'to cut.' *Šarru* being the name of the king in Babylonia and Assyria, we naturally look for an Assyrian etymology of the word. Now in Assyria *šarûru* is 'to shine,' *šarûru* is the magnificent splendor of the stars, of the rising sun (*šarûr šamsi*). It is a synonym of the common Assyrian word *mêlammu* (W. A. I. ii. 35, 7 e. f.) especially applied to the splendor of royal majesty. Tiglath Pileser I. styles himself 'the bright day whose splendor overthrows the four quarters of the universe.' Observe also the proud appellation *šamaš mâtî*, 'the sun of the country,' often used by Assyrian and Babylonian monarchs. It cannot be doubted that this explanation of *šar* is in full accordance with oriental modes of thought."

Whether in an introduction to a new Hebrew dictionary or in a Hebrew dictionary of his own, which we are happy to be assured has been compiled along with his greatly needed Assyrian Dictionary, Dr. Delitzsch may be certain of a warm welcome for his wide research and masculine thought.

The quarterly statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund for January, 1884, reprints from the "London Times" of December 29, 1883, an interesting letter by Ch. Clermont Ganneau. Its subject is "Two Inscriptions of King Nebuchadnezzar on Lebanon." M. Pognon, recently assistant consul at Beirut, is the fortunate discoverer. Already he was known favorably to the learned world as the author of "The Inscription of Bavian." M. Ganneau tells us, that he was one of the most brilliant scholars of the *École des Hautes Études* when he himself lectured there, and pursued Oriental archaeology under his own instruction. The texts were engraved on the rock in Wady Brissa, one of the wildest valleys in the Eastern Lebanon, six miles from Hermel, a village near the Orontes, marked by a famous Phœnician monument. The two inscriptions face one another on the right and left of the path running through the hollow of the valley. They measure 5.50 metres in breadth by 2.80 metres in

height. In script, one is archaic, the other cursive cuneiform, together covering nineteen columns. A bas-relief accompanies each. The first depicts a personage with the Assyrian tiara, seizing an animal (perhaps a lion) which stands erect upon its hind legs. Behind this was originally the image of a deity, now effaced, but still made sure by the fragmentary words, "To the Goddess who exalts, who inhabits the temple of Goula the temple," etc. The second bas-relief represents a man worshipping before a tree. He wears a cap curious in shape, with closed points like the mitre of a bishop. Each inscription, though different in text, begins alike with the title of Nebuchadnezzar, "Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, the illustrious Pastor, the servant of Merodak, the great Lord his Creator, and of Nebo his illustrious son, whom His Royalty loves."

It was to be expected that the condition of the inscriptions would be mutilated. This is the case to a deplorable degree. In one text the bottom, in the other the middle, is missing. The latter was the work of a Maghrabi, if M. Pognon's information be correct, a treasure-seeker cutting through the rock. Certainly the stone appears to have been cut away to the depth of several inches with an iron instrument. Notwithstanding the defacement, M. Pognon has read the enumeration of the wines on the table of the god Merodak and of the goddess Zarpanit—a list already familiar to us from the Phillips Cylinder.

The site of these inscriptions seems to M. Pognon to be *architectural* rather than *military*. Here was a timber-yard of Nebuchadnezzar! In the marred arrow-heads the great king is speaking of buildings which he is erecting in Babylon. What we know from other texts of the quantity of wood consumed in the monarch's sumptuous temples and palaces makes Lebanon one great lumber tract. In one of these inscriptions Nebuchadnezzar says, "I have employed for the wood-work of the Chamber of Oracles the largest of the trees I have had conveyed from Lebanon." M. Ganneau recalls the Latin inscriptions of Upper Lebanon, engraved on the rock by hundreds and reserving for the state, in the name of the Emperor Hadrian, the pine, the larch, the fir, and the cedar for the imperial fleets. It is not improbable that the two inscriptions of M. Pognon are edicts of preservation for the forests of the crown. If so, the Babylonian king was a model for American legislators, as the French government, in its appointment of an Assyriologue to a consular post adjoining Assyrian remains, is a suggestion to the American government respecting our present consul at Jerusalem, the Assyriologue, Dr. Selah Merrill.

It is a pleasant coincidence that the "Journal Asiatique" of December last has an annotated translation, by the same youthful French scholar, of the inscription of Mérou-Nérar I., King of Assyria. By ingenious reasoning M. Pognon shows that the date of this prince is a century at least before Tiglath Pileser I. What is a text running back thus to the thirteenth century B. C.? Simply the most ancient of all texts edited in Assyrian properly so-called. This venerable monument is in archaic characters. Since these are used in the latest period, however, especially if ornamenting a palace, M. Pognon prefers to call the letters *Capital* letters. He has transcribed them into the cursive character. This matches the Egyptian *hieratic*, being suited to rapid writing. The seventy-nine lines relate to the restoration of a temple. Their chief

interest lies in the imprecations which we copy. Observe their particularity and their superstition.

"When in time to come this temple shall become old and fall to ruin, may the prince then on the throne restore it. Let him put in place my inscription, reinscribing the name there written; Asshur will hearken to his prayers. Whoever shall erase the name which the temple bears and substitute his own, and whoever shall remove my inscription, destroy it, cast it into the river, burn it in the fire, hide it in the ground, place it in a secluded spot where it cannot be seen; whoever shall cause it to be taken by a rebel, by a stranger, by an enemy, by a mutineer, by a tribe in revolt, by any person soever, or whoever shall think of doing it any other mischief, may Asshur . . . who inhabits the temple E-Kharrieh-Kourra, may Anu, Bel, Ea, Istar, may all the great gods, the Igigi of Heaven and the Anounak of earth, strike him violently with their hands; may they raise against him in wrath a dire malediction; may they obliterate from earth his name, his race, his retainers, his family. Let their august mouth order the devastation of his land and the annihilation of his people and of the boundary-marks of his frontiers. May Mérou whelm him in a deluge of woes; may he send into his land tempest and noxious wind, rebellion, destruction, whirlwind, want, famine, drouth, and poverty; may he sweep his country like a tempest; may he heap it up with ruined mounds."—*Month of the Offering of the Gods, 20th day Eponymy of Salmanan-Karradan.*

Such remains confirm for the hundredth time M. François Lenormant's brilliant investigations in Chaldean magic. All the more do they emphasize the void which was made by the death of this great scholar, December 9, 1883. He was a savant and a Christian. The American public, hardly a twelvemonth before his end, had received in English his "Beginnings of History." Professor Francis Brown, in the introduction to this remarkable work, called attention to the author's rare versatility. What was there said, "He has been by turns traveler, excavator, essayist, decipherer, grammarian, historian, editor, and can point to productive labor in all these pursuits," has found confirmation from every quarter since his early demise. The whole ancient world was his textbook. Born in 1837, he was not yet twenty-one years old when his first published work, "*Essai sur la Classification des Monnaies des Lagides*," won for him the numismatic prize of the Académie des Inscriptions. This was in 1856. In the "Academy" of March 8, 1884, Professor A. H. Sayce of Oxford pays a fitting tribute to his memory. He speaks, as only a friend and fellow-worker could speak, of Lenormant's gigantic powers of work, his wide sympathies, his quickness of perception, his unrivaled erudition. A born antiquarian, he walked in the light of the connection between oriental studies and classical archæology, till he made others recognize it like himself. He was intellectually a channel between Mesopotamia and the Mediterranean. Few scholars, if any, were equally at home with him in the monuments of Western Asia and in the remains of classic antiquity. The list of his publications is enormous. When we reflect that he died ere he had completed his thirty-seventh year, we are amazed at his productiveness. He must have made mistakes; and pedants were not wanting to brand them. That these became stepping-stones to truth and growth speaks volumes for his sincerity and docility. His transparent thought and lucid style were not his only claim to honor. From the day when, a youth of fourteen, he wrote his letter to M. Hase on the Greek tablets of Memphis, down to the moment when, on his bed, languishing from a wound received in the siege of Paris, he pondered

the question of the Hittites, Lenormant was an original, suggestive, and inspiring thinker. His "Manual of Ancient History" has enlarged the bounds of existing knowledge. Assyriology owes him a debt for his acute and profound Accadian researches. Preëminently was he a first-hand investigator and popularizer of recondite knowledge. Alas, that his great works on the "Propagation of the Phœnician Alphabet," the "History of Money in Antiquity," and the "Masterpieces of Greek Art" must remain torsos still. The man who could clothe archæology with flesh and blood, the theologian who brought the monuments to be witnesses to the Old Testament, has passed from earth.

W. Flinders Petrie, the author of "Pyramids and Temples of Gizeh," has been engaged by the Egypt Exploration Fund to conduct operations in the Delta. Thanks to Professor Maspero's generous coöperation, the necessary concession has been obtained from the Egyptian government, and operations have been begun at San (Zoan-Tanis?). It is understood that M. Naville, who opened the society's first campaign with the discovery of Pithom in the Wady Tumilat, will not be present on the scene of action. His variorum edition of the "Livre des Morts" engrosses his whole time. But he will edit the inscriptions found by Mr. Petrie.

Professor A. H. Sayce tells us in the "Academy" of January 19, 1884, p. 51, that his recent tour in the Fayûm has been an archæological disappointment. The remains of the Labyrinth at Howâra do not justify Herodotus' praises of the edifice. The most interesting antiquities in the district are the vast mounds of Krokodilopolis with their streets of ancient brick houses and the two ruined monuments which stand side by side at Biahmu. The corner of one of the latter exists to prove that it was once a pyramid with an angle like the pyramid of Medûm. In size and in cutting the stones reminded Professor Sayce of Medûm. So, also, did the absence of cement to join them. Murray and Baedeker's accounts he pronounces alike incorrect. In the same letter he speaks of three clay cylinders in the Bûlak Museum which M. Maspero has lately exhumed at Tell Defenneh (Pelusiæ Daphne), a little west of Kantâra on Suez Canal. They were inscribed with Babylonian cuneiform characters and were all records of Nebuchadnezzar. Very badly written and treating only of the royal building in Babylon, these cylinders were plainly meant to be memorials of his conquest of foreign countries. They are thus curious proofs of Nebuchadnezzar's invasion of Egypt. All three begin, "Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, son of Nabopolassar, King of Babylon, am I."

The next letter in the "Academy" of February 2, 1884, p. 84, is redolent of palms and bees near the temple of Seti amid the ruins of ancient Osiris. Among the *graffiti* covering the walls of the two chief temples Professor Sayce copied thirty-three Carian inscriptions, two only of which were known before, forty-four Cypriote, and more than sixty Phœnician. Of the Greek inscriptions most are of the Ptolemaic era. The most honest, if not edifying, asserts, "I, Nicanor, am come with Heracleia — drunk." Before taking the postal boat for Luxor, Professor Sayce paid a visit to a newly-discovered statue of the Goddess Sekket at Uladaihoweh. The statue is of great size and exquisite finish. It bears the cartouche of Amenophis III. Near by are fragments of stone with the titles of Rameses II. Not far away is a tomb containing two

chambers, in one of which are seated images of the proprietors of the tomb. The same group, seated in the midst of the Egyptian Trinity, is sculptured at the end of the second chamber, opposite the entrance. Two heraldic lions, back to back, are on the right of this chamber. They support the setting sun. In form and position these lions reminded him of Asia Minor and Babylonia, bearing a striking resemblance to the famous lions of Mykênæ. Sayce regards sculpture a sure mark of Asiatic influence, exercised on Egypt through wars of the XVIII. dynasty. Girgheh, he thinks, with Mariette, occupies the site of the long-lost, long-sought city, which was the birth-place of the founder of the united monarchy of Egypt.

The learned Oxford Professor is not alone in bringing spoils from the land of the Nile. European museums and the modern press do their part in the fascinating work. Professor Maspero has unearthed in the Turin collection, where it was slumbering like the mummied kings of Thebes, the Egyptian version of the fable of the Belly and the Members. It opens as follows: "Case of Belly versus Head: wherein are published the pleadings made before the supreme judges in the presence of the President, who kept watch in order that the Liar should be unmasked." The boastful speech of the head succeeds, claiming to be queen of all the body, "whose eyes see, whose ears hear, whose nostrils inhale the air, whose mouth has the gift of speech." This was found at Turin and appears in Maspero's III. fascicule of his "*Études Égyptiennes*."

In his new handbook to the Bûlak Museum the same accomplished authority differs from Mariette in some important points. One is the funerary cones of baked clay and stamped, which have been an enigma to explorers. Mariette thought them to have been boundaries, marking the extent of land belonging to each grave. This seemed plausible; for they were found buried in the sand in front of the oldest tombs of the Theban necropolis. Maspero takes them, however, to be imitation bread-offerings. Their powdered white coating is, in his view, the mixture of fine white flour and salt which was presented sacrificially to gods and dead alike. In his own words, "Just as at Memphis, under the ancient empire, geese and loaves carved in stone were destined to provide the dead with geese and loaves which should endure forever, so at Thebes they provided the deceased with bread more durable than real bread. Thus the image of an object offered in this world procured for the soul the reality of that object in the next world. If we do not find cones at Memphis, it is for the reason why we do not find stone geese at Thebes. Each city followed its own customs, and we need not look to find those customs prevailing elsewhere."

The above facts are from the "Academy" of December 8, 1883, and January 12, 1884. The number of February 23, 1884, contains the widely quoted letter of Miss Amelia B. Edwards. In this she mentions and laments the wholesale demolition among the ruins of Upper Egypt. "Where the cliffs overhang the Nile, the tunneled tombs, with which these precipices are terraced, are blasted, smashed, and shot down by hundreds of tons daily." To arrest this vandalism, Maspero has organized a corps of archæological police. If excavation loses, preservation gains. This novel band consists of twenty-seven local guardians under the control of six inspectors. They are to patrol the Pyramids, Abydos, Denderah, Thebes, and Edfro. With these coöperate the pupils of his school of

native archæology, in which young Egyptians of talent are taught modern European and Egyptian hieroglyphs. From their ability to read royal cartouches they will make excellent overseers of excavations.

The American School of Archæology at Athens is stimulating our English brethren to write at least in favor of a British prototype on Grecian soil. Professor Goodwin's forecast of the establishment of such an English school the present year is perhaps sanguine. None the less does the "Athenæum" of February 9th contain a summary of the learned Professor's appeal to Americans for a permanent endowment. "Teachers of Greek letters and art in the higher institutions of the United States need such a school. There can be no better fitting of such instructors than eight months' study of Greece herself. To learn the secret of her architecture through acquaintance with her temples is an ideal method. What can be finer than to explore Greek geography and history by visiting Greek battle-fields and famous cities, and tracing great lines of communication through mountain passes? If one know modern Greek in its literary form, so as to speak it, he knows ancient Greek more livingly. Where the ordinary teacher of Greek would be profited by this course, an archæologist would be still more the gainer from the inexhaustible material at hand. Under Professor Goodwin, it appears that besides frequent meetings for reading and discussion, the eight students in attendance last year produced papers on the following subjects: the Pnyx; the Erechtheum; the life, poems, and language of Theocritus; the Inscriptions of Assos discovered by the American Expedition; the value of modern Greek to the classical student, and the Theatre of Dionysus of Athens."

It is pleasant to learn from the London "Times" ("Mail") of March 21, 1884, that Mr. Sterrett, of the American school at Athens, accompanied Mr. W. M. Ramsay in his explorations of Asia Minor in 1883. The two gentlemen explored the Phrygian mountains north of Kara-Hissar, the chief seat of the pre-Hellenic civilization of Phrygia. Three inscriptions and several monuments rewarded their toils. One of these seemed to Mr. Ramsay of the first consequence. Professor C. Robert, of Berlin, agrees with him, owning the debt of science for his discovery of reliefs bearing on the history of Greek art as influenced by Asia Minor. "Of especial importance, in my opinion, are (1) the rock portal, as giving the original type of the Ionic column, and setting at rest all doubts as to its derivation and significance; and (2) the Cybele relief, the lions of which are closely related to those of Mykênæ." The aim of the explorations was mainly topographical, and render possible for the first time an intelligible map of the country. Incidentally, Mr. Ramsay and Mr. Sterrett copied 450 inscriptions. Of these the most noteworthy are (1) the letter of Trajan thanking a lady of Pessinas for gifts of garments; (2) a series of Christian inscriptions from A. D. 121 onwards. Mr. Ramsay's diligent and fruitful researches in his life-field are commended by scholars like M. Waddington, M. Georges Perrot, Professor Kiepert, and Professor Mommsen. Professor Ernst Curtius says, "Mr. Ramsay's researches are of great importance for the history of the Greek people. . . . Thanks to him the Asiatic home of the Hellenes has been rediscovered, and the oldest sculptured relief in European Greece, which hitherto stood entirely alone, the device of the Pelopide, has found many parallels in Phrygia. . . . The rock sculptures of Phrygia are the oldest

Runes of pre-historic Greece. . . . But we are not dealing with a foretime which is without history. The mingling of Semitic and Aryan nationalities, the formation from various centres of distinct empires, the oldest military roads with their stations, — these are questions the answer to which must be given by topography. . . . Here is virgin soil for the student of early European history, and for a work of lasting value beyond the powers of any hasty tourist. . . . Mr. Ramsay, with an intelligent appreciation of the monumental materials, unites the historical and geographical insight necessary for a right understanding of the problems connected with them." If we refrain from further detail, it is because our readers can consult the "Boston Daily Advertiser" of April 8, 1884, where the whole letter is republished. The immense value of these explorations should be a new spur to the support of the American Archæological School at Athens. This we may add to the immediate result of enabling Mr. Ramsay to continue the path marked out by Leake, Stewart, and Hamilton. Christian scholarship hails with gratitude the new opening of the "world between Greece and Assyria, between Europe and the East."

We are on *Greek* ground still when we epitomize the paper of Mr. A. Lang on the "Iron Age in Greece," published in the "Antiquary" of March, 1884. Professor Sayce's view was that the introduction of iron-working into Greece is very late. One of his arguments was the surprise of a Spartan, about 550 B. C., according to Herodotus, who saw iron beaten out by a Tegetan blacksmith. Mr. Lang submits that iron-making might have been an art long practiced in Greece, but practiced in the mystery which many crafts affect. On the other hand, "Herodotus says Glaucus of Chios invented the soldering of iron, and he was certainly earlier than 550 B. C." Professor Sayce claims philology and archæology accord in requiring a late date. Mr. Lang shows that philology, in the person of Max Müller, declared in 1863, "iron was *not known* to the Aryans before separation," and in 1868 said, on the same point, "there can be no doubt iron *was known* and its value appreciated." Archæology, in the person of Schliemann, vacillates not less absurdly. When he wrote "Troy" in 1876, "Schliemann found no iron, but believed it existed." "When he wrote 'Ilios,' 1880, he had found iron, but believed it did not exist." Dr. O. Schrader, Professor Sayce's favorite authority, Mr. Lang says is against him. For he cites Homer as a witness to the early use of iron in Greece. According to Schrader, while coinage is still unknown to Homer, payments are made in *iron* and other metals by way of barter. Homer uses iron as synonym for sword. Moreover, the Parian marble assigns the invention of iron to the mythic date of Minos, and Strabo says Sophocles regarded the imaginary Dactyli as the first inventors and workers of iron. These dates are vastly prior to 550 B. C. Mr. Lang concedes the force of Sayce's argument from the absence of iron remains in the older Greek sites. Corrosion and decomposition might, however, account for this, and it is a well-known fact that not a shard of iron of the pre-celtic age exists. That iron was used in the Great Pyramid is beyond dispute, according to Mr. Petrie. For a final settlement of the question, iron remains, in connection with archaic potteries on undoubted and undisturbed Greek sites, seem essential. It is to be hoped the Oxford Professor will notice the foregoing vigorous counter-statement to his own article in the "Journal of Philology," 1883.

From Greece we pass to Rome and Signor Rodolfo Lanciani, who was

the first to announce the discovery of the Atrium Vestæ to the "Athenæum." In last October, he says in the issue of January 19th, "people abroad cannot conceive faintly of the impression which every one in Rome felt in stepping over the threshold of the Atrium Vestæ, in entering those cloisters, the marble population of which is increasing in number and in importance every day. The noble, dignified portrait-statues of the *virgines vestales maximæ* are there standing in a long array, ready to welcome the visitors and glad to have recovered possession of the house which for eleven centuries has been the witness of their joys and sorrows, the depository of their secrets, and from which they were brutally expelled in A. D. 394." The "Athenæum" of February 2d contains from the same pen some interesting notes on the subject brought before our readers by Principal Bancroft in our March number. Signor Lanciani adverts to the importation of the worship of Hestia from Alba. Because fire was not easy to procure from friction or flint, each village kept a common fire (*focus publicus*) in a central hut. Numa Pompilius found this custom in the curiæ. Instead of abolishing he perpetuated it in a round straw hut on the borders of the Velabrum between the Palatine and the Capitol, where was a public market. At the famous shrine thus begun the care of watching the fire was committed to four virgins. Servius Tullius raised the number to six, and in the fourth century A. D., it was increased to seven. The directorship of the Atrium Vestæ and of its sisterhood belonged to the oldest virgin. She was called *Virgo Vestalis Maxima*. In prestige she equaled, if she did not excel, the empress herself. Secrets and documents of state and wills of emperors were intrusted to her. The vestal virgins as a body were peace-makers. In this benignant capacity they were sought by Cæsar in his quarrel with Sulla, and Vitellius in his fight with Vespasian. Since the virgins were received under ten years of age, they might become *directresses* when still young. This did not often happen however. The vitality and the domesticity of the nuns stood in the way. Few left the Atrium at the termination of the legal term of thirty years' service. "So the *vestalis maxima*, as a rule, coupled with the dignity of her position the dignity of old age." Julia Silana became a *maxima* after seventy-four years. Occia, the predecessor of Torquata had been the superior of the college for fifty-seven years. Signor Lanciani hoped to find records with the names of the vestal virgins, the dates of their cooptation and death, and most of all the list of the lady-abbesses. He was disappointed. His consolation is the splendid set of pedestals with statues and eulogistic inscriptions raised to the honor of the *vestales maximæ*. Alas, that four fifths of them should have succumbed to the lime-burners and stone-cutters of the Middle Ages. But thirty-six have been preserved, twenty-eight being recovered in the Atrium itself. He gives fourteen. The most striking is Flavia Publicia, A. D. 247. "She was tall and queenly in appearance, of noble demeanor, of a sweet and gentle, if not handsome, face." Seven of her pedestals have been found already. Hardly less notable is an unknown abbess of rare chastity, modesty, and learning. The date is June 9, 364. Her name is erased, in all probability, Lanciani suggests, because of her conversion to the gospel. This would be a similar conquest of the new faith to that named by Prudentius Paristeph, hymn 2.

Returning home, it remains to chronicle the approaching "Summer Schools of the American Institute of Hebrew." These are three in num-

ber, being located at Chicago, Chautauqua, and Worcester, respectively. To the scholarly enthusiasm and magnetic power, as a teacher, of Professor William R. Harper, Ph. D., of the Chicago Baptist Union Theological Seminary, these schools are due. Their aim has been twofold: (1) They seek to enlist and fix the interest of the ministry in the ancient language of the Old Testament. (2) They are meant to encourage men of special gifts and aptitudes to undertake advanced Semitic study. The Hebrew Summer School is also intended to supplement the Hebrew Correspondence School, which, within two years, has grown from a membership of forty to a membership of over five hundred. Its main features are admirable. They embrace and emphasize the principles of induction, memorizing, and translating at sight. The classes are elementary, intermediate, progressive, and advanced. Last year at Chicago the beginners' class, numbering sixteen, committed to memory the first chapter of Genesis, translated critically Gen. ii.-xii., did a little extempore translation in Samuel and Psalms, memorized three hundred words, and learned the essentials of the grammar, a portion of the noun excepted. This was from July 11th to August 16th. So excellent a record is likely to be equaled, if not surpassed, the coming year. The advanced class, among other things, then discussed the historicity of the Book of Jonah with great interest and profit. This year it will grapple with "Driver's Hebrew Tenses" and with Hebrew synonyms and poetry, studying exegetically Genesis xlix., Deuteronomy xxxii. and xxxiii., and Judges v., and translating at sight in Kings, Ruth, Lamentations, and Ecclesiastes. Zeal and application are needed in the pupils. The instructors come equipped with experience and devotion. Professor Harper is a host in himself. Mr. Gurney and Mr. Price are young men of great teaching and linguistic ability, who have been under Professor Harper's instruction for five years and are his aids in the correspondence work. Add to these, at Worcester, such competent and honored teachers as Professor C. R. Brown, of Newton Theological Institution, Professor H. G. Mitchell, Ph. D., of Boston University, and Professor D. G. Lyon, Ph. D., of Harvard, and the faculty is seen to be very strong. But this is not all. Special classes are organized in Chaldee, Syriac, Arabic, and last, but not least, under Professor Lyon, in Assyrian, for which some six or eight applications for admission have already been made. There are also to be lectures from some of the foremost biblical scholars in America. Among these we notice with gratification the names of Professors Bissell, Briggs, Denio, and Rev. P. A. Nordell. With a healthful home in Worcester Academy and a high ambition to succeed, the school, with its 175 members, has the promise of a splendid month. We do not know of an expenditure of ten dollars' fee and four weeks' time better fitted to unlock the archæological and philological treasures of the Word of God. The Worcester Summer School of Hebrew opens August 5, 1884, at 2 P. M. It follows the Chautauqua school, which continues from July 22d to August 19th, as this will follow the Chicago school, whose sessions are from July 1st to July 30th. After the first week Professor Harper will teach in person the first sections of the elementary and intermediate classes each for two hours a day, the progressive class in the study of Gesenius' Grammar, and the advanced class in their grammatical work and in the study of Genesis xlix., Deuteronomy xxxii., xxxiii., and Judges v. The best wishes of every scholar go with him.

John Phelps Taylor.

BOOK NOTICES.

THE ONE MEDIATOR. Bampton Lectures for 1882. By PETER GOLDSMITH MEDD, M. A., Honorary Canon of St. Alban's, etc. London: Rivingtons. 1884.

This volume of the Bampton Lectures is not up to the standard of many of its predecessors. It bears no comparison with Bernard's "Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament," Liddon's "Our Lord's Divinity," or others that might be named. The principal thought of Canon Medd's book is comprehensive and elevated, but the development is disappointing. The thought is that Christ is more than a mediator between God and sinful man; that the creation of the Universe and its administration, as well as the redemption of sinners, is included in his Mediatorship. The salvation of man is but "a special function of a larger office, a result of a wider mediatorial relation in which he stands to unfallen as well as to fallen natures, indeed to all created existence." This view is sustained by the prologue of John's Gospel and by Paul's representations of Christ as the head not only of the church, but, antecedently, of the whole creation. Thus considered there is ground for the belief that, if man had never sinned, the Incarnation would have been accomplished as the means of perfect communion between man and God, and also as vitally related to all created intelligences. The view thus opened has grandeur and is in complete harmony with various declarations of the Bible. It removes some restrictions by which the Incarnation has been narrowed. It is a view, however, which is held by nearly every profound theologian, and which is clearly set forth in many doctrinal systems, from several of which Canon Medd makes copious quotations.

The first two lectures contain about all the writer has to say on this great subject. The remaining lectures consist of obvious reiterations and amplifications of the original theme. There is extended comment on the theophanies of the Old Testament, the angel of Jehovah, the visions of the prophets, mediation through the law and the ritual, the successive events of Christ's life in their sacrificial aspect, and his continued mediation since the ascension. It is remarkable that in a work on this subject the attempt is nowhere made to get beneath the fact of mediation to its necessity and characteristics. There is no hint of a philosophy of the atonement, but only devout recognition of the reconciliation effected.

Problems which perplex all intelligent students of the Bible are approached and disposed of with an enviable serenity which can be begotten only of unenviable ignorance. Concerning Christ's predictions of his second coming for example, he says: "Looking closely at the twenty-fourth chapter of Saint Matthew, we discover a clear line between the first and second portions of the great prophecy. Surely our Lord himself has given us the key to the primary application of the first portion in his words repeated with all but verbal identity by the three Synoptists: 'Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass away till all these things be fulfilled.'" The key, hung where it is, happens to be the very thing which makes such an interpretation difficult.

Again, Christ's mediation in the unseen world between his death and

resurrection Canon Medd accepts as real. He thinks that the preaching to the spirits in prison was a proclamation of mercy to souls in Hades. But his opinion is carefully stated that for all souls eternal destiny is decided during the earthly life, and that the mercy offered to those who were disobedient in the time of Noah was not to all, but to such as "at the very last, when there was no longer escape from the awful and sudden judgment of the flood, turned to God with a repentance which should preserve or rekindle the spark of life within, and so render it possible for their spirits to be saved, albeit we know not in how forever diminished glory and beauty, in the day of the Lord Jesus." This explanation has at least the merit of originality.

The book is an incompetent handling of a great theme. The writer is more pious than philosophical. One indication of the quality of his thought is found in his free use of capital letters. When he employs them with such words as grace, love, truth, sacrifice, body, law, judgment, dispensation, veil, presence, priesthood, we are almost sensible of the unction with which they were uttered, and can hear the churchly cadence of tone with which the lectures were delivered. Such a book, whatever value it may have for devout believers who are edified by pious meditation, has no value as a contribution to thorough discussion of the biblical, critical, and doctrinal grounds of our Lord's mediatorial work. It does not accomplish the objects of the Bampton lectureship.

George Harris.

THE IDEAS OF THE APOSTLE PAUL, translated into their modern equivalents by JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE, author of "Self Culture," "Ten Great Religions," "Events and Epochs in Religious History," etc. Crown 8vo. pp. xiv., 436. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co. 1884.

Is the distinctive value of Paul's writings derived from their author's spiritual and intellectual endowments, or from his personal connection with the risen Christ? To this crucial question Dr. Clarke heartily gives the Christian believer's answer. Paul's teaching, in his view, flowed from the experience of Christ which began at his conversion and was ever after the dominant feature of his inner life. "It was not a vision of Christ, but Christ himself, who appeared to Paul. He was seen, not by his outward eye, but by an inward revelation. . . . The mighty light which shone around, so that the dazzling brightness of that terrible desert mid-day sun was eclipsed by it, was only the external part of the miracle. Paul saw something else, heard something else, which his companions did not see nor hear. He stood face to face with the majestic tenderness of the transfigured Redeemer. . . . Trembling, his eyes dark, his soul full of a new light, he rose and went to Damascus, and there heard from a Christian voice the words, 'Brother Saul, receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost.' So there he became a Christian, there he was taught to know Jesus. . . . What a fearful resolution was Paul now called upon to take! It was to give up everything he had loved and lived for; to join the feeble sect he had been persecuting. . . . It was necessary for Paul to have the aid of his fellow Christians in passing through this awful crisis of his being, and Ananias was sent to pray with him. While he prayed, the outward sight returned, and at the same moment that inward strength and new life was given which was to do such a mighty work in the world."

A representation of Paul's teaching which finds its root in this supernatural experience must be essentially evangelical in the true sense of the word. Instead of saying with the rationalist, "not Paul but Jesus," Dr. Clarke would say with the church catholic, "Jesus as revealed in and through Paul." His clear conviction of the value of Christianity as a remedial work of God underlies his interpretation of the Pauline writings. He finds in them a body of truth about God in his relations to man. If some of the doctrines which the church catholic has found in them are to be set aside, it is because they are not deducible from the apostle's words. In these is to be found in its fullest statement Christianity, the hope of the world. Dr. Clarke proceeds to state those truths as he conceives them to have lain in Paul's mind, taking occasion to controvert the Calvinistic interpretation of the Pauline writings. His exposition is marked by his usual clearness and force, and sometimes rises into true Christian eloquence. Evangelical feeling glows in his justification of prayer. "I am inclined to think . . . that the best things are had for asking. Experience sometimes confirms the saying of Jesus, 'Blessed are those who hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled.' If prayer is the soul's sincere desire, uttered or unexpressed; if it is the flight of one alone to the only God; if it is a perpetual seeking, knocking, asking in spirit and in truth, then I think that those who ask receive; those who seek find; to those who knock, the door is opened." Dr. Clarke's restatement of the Pauline teaching brings it into accord with the conceptions of that type of Unitarianism represented by Dr. Channing. It is claimed by him that the passages in which the distinctively orthodox views have been found, examined by the methods of modern exegesis, do not yield those views. The authority of German scholarship is appealed to with a confidence which can only be accounted for by supposing that Dr. Clarke has not found time to examine the works of the most distinguished later exegetes of Germany. It does seem strange that the sweeping statement, "that Paul never regarded Christ as God, is the opinion of the leading scholars of the Continent, who study his writings with the perfect impartiality of emancipated critics," is supported by the single authority of Baur, whose department is history, not exegesis, and whom Dr. Clarke elsewhere controverts as twisting facts in the interest of his rationalistic theories. Why are Olshausen, Tholuck, De Wette, Meyer, and Weiss, to all of whom Dr. Clarke elsewhere refers, passed over? This hasty and incorrect assumption is a serious blemish upon the book. The exegesis which Dr. Clarke offers as a substitute for the orthodox explanation of leading passages also shows a lack of appreciation of the scientific method of the German scholars.

For example, in arguing that the doctrine of a vicarious atonement is not found in Paul's writings, the meaning of Romans iii. 25, 26, is said to be, "God has made Jesus such a mercy-seat where man can commune with Him by faith. . . . It is a manifestation of his present immediate love. It shows that God is just, as well as merciful, in forgiving our sins, because his forgiveness takes them away and leaves them in the past."

Dr. Clarke's rendering of *ἱλαστήριον* by "mercy-seat" instead of "propitiatory sacrifice" has high authority in its favor, though in our opinion not the highest. But the scholars who so render it find the propitiatory meaning in it. The blood of the victims sprinkled on the cover of the ark, or mercy-seat, made it the place where God's pardoning grace, obtained through the sacrifice, was localized in the Hebrew symbolism, so

that the mercy-seat was inseparably connected in the Hebrew mind with propitiation. That Paul conceived of God as made propitious by Christ's death is evident from his words, "through faith in his blood." It is also evident from his adding, "To show his righteousness in passing over sins that are past." Dr. Clarke's paraphrase, "his forgiveness takes them away and leaves them in the past," is a perversion apparently due to the use of the English version; τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων means, of course, sins which formerly happened. Paul says that God showed himself righteous in forgiving these sins by setting forth Christ as a blood-besprinkled mercy-seat (if we accept this rendering), that is, representing to mankind a forgiveness procured through the Saviour's death. Dr. Clarke claims that Paul says in Romans v. 10, that "when we were enemies to God we were reconciled to Him" (that is won to his friendship) by the death of his Son. But the clause in the preceding verse to which this statement corresponds is, "while we were yet sinners Christ died for us," that is, as the apostle explains, died for us as a man might die for the sake of a friend, — take his place. One of the passages in which Paul has most plainly taught the vicariousness of Christ's death, Gal. iii. 13, "Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us," Dr. Clarke has scarcely noticed. It must also be said that it should not be affirmed that Paul has taught the ultimate salvation of all, on the strength of 1 Cor. xv. 28, "God shall be all in all," without at least mentioning those passages in which he has said that some will be finally lost.

Dr. Clarke says of Paul: "Notice the precision of his language. Each phrase has its own exact meaning, every word tells; he uses no vague generalities." He also, as we have said, owns the value of modern exegetical scholarship in its elucidation of Paul's writings. He therefore obliges us to subject his representation of those writings to exegetical tests. That it will not, in its distinctively Unitarian features, bear these tests may be safely asserted. Modern exegesis has certainly shown that the distinctively evangelical tenets are imbedded in Paul's writings. It has also shown that some of the Calvinistic tenets against which Unitarianism revolts are not contained in them.

Many passages in the book show a spiritual appreciation of Christ which is thoroughly Pauline. The words, "Paul regards the whole creation as tending towards Christ, and meant to be ultimately redeemed by the fullness of his love," remind us of those other golden words of the apostle, "No man can call Jesus Lord, but by the Holy Ghost."

Edward Y. Hincks.

THE PRINCIPLES OF WRITTEN DISCOURSE. By THEODORE W. HUNT, Ph. D., Professor of Rhetoric and English Language in the College of New Jersey. pp. 362. N. Y. A. C. Armstrong & Son.

This book is designed for the use of students in the higher classes in colleges. The objects proposed by the author, as defined by himself, are as follows: to give a true definition of discourse; to establish guiding principles to reveal the basis of discourse in a true philosophy of the mind, to present the true relations of the science and the art of discourse, to connect the study of discourse with that of literature and language to reveal the close relations of discourse to a practical knowledge of the world and human life; to make emphatic, throughout, the moral element in discourse.

The treatment is in two parts. Part I. includes the topics: definition of discourse (1); parts of discourse; material and media of discourse; processes of discourse; laws of discourse. Part II., definition of discourse (2); qualities of discourse; forms of discourse.

Although the title of the book is "The Principles of *Written Discourse*," the relations of composition to oral address are not neglected. The author says: "In presenting the subject of discourse we shall not be careful to make either of its divisions—written and oral—prominent at first over the other. We treat the subject of discourse in its comprehensiveness as the expression of our thought in language. We study its laws and processes, its qualities and objects applicable alike to the writer and orator. This being done, there are two specific courses to be followed, in addition to this general one, arising out of the desire or purpose of the writer to deliver his composition publicly."

The title is intended to limit the treatment, in order that elocution and extempore address may be left to other and special works.

Professor Hunt has recast the materials common to the standard treatises, wrought in with these the results of his study and reflection guided by his experience as a teacher of the art and practice of rhetoric, constructing the whole into a system from his own point of view. And it is from the latter we discern the peculiar excellence of his work. He conceives discourse as a transaction. It is a communication of thought and feeling from one person to another, or to many others. In writing for readers, the mind and the heart are in action, the expression is by the medium of language; in reading, the mind is in action in interpretation, the heart in sympathy. In oratory, the whole personality is in action in the transmission of thought and feeling, by vocal and bodily signs of thought and emotion. The aims are information, conviction, persuasion, and incitement of the motive forces, in order to decision or action, or both.

It is evident that a true and complete theory of discourse must be based on psychology and the nature and laws of expression. The writer and speaker must employ their powers normally, and must deal in the same manner with the powers of the reader and hearer. And the media of communication between these must be natural to both. And in practice there must be a distinction between absolute and relative expression. The former may be sufficient to *record* thought. The latter is efficient to *communicate* thought. It is not enough that the writer utter himself; he must convey himself to the reader. The first form of a discourse, in the mind of the writer, may be conditioned by the laws of mind and language; the last form must be adapted to the receptivity of the reader. Otherwise there is no *transaction*.

We have before us, accordingly, an attempt at a *rational* rhetoric. The following quotation will present this aspect of the treatise.

"The science of discourse is not a mental science formally viewed. It finds therein, however, its basis, laws, and suggestive method. He will utterly fail in this department who attempts the study out of its relations to the laws of the human intellect, and thus fails to connect at every point the external forms of expression with the inward action of the soul. The student must be familiar with these mental powers, their laws, methods, and conditions of action. He must be acquainted with the mind he is using and addressing. He must know how the mind works; must understand his nature as mental, moral, and emotional. In a word, he must know man in his complex character. Here is seen

the psychology of discourse. It is an art whose discussion need not be metaphysical, but shown to be based upon those fundamental facts which have been derived from a close observation of our mental processes. Discourse is the art by which rational minds express themselves in a rational manner. He is doing a most valuable work in the interests of this art who ever insists upon thus exalting it above the purely verbal into the higher realm of the philosophic and mental."

This is the master-idea which has possessed the author and given direction and form to his work. Discourse is a rational process of expression in order to *impression*. As, for example, "the theme should be suggested by the specific *object* or *purpose* we have in writing." "The most necessary business of the exordium," says Aristotle, "is to throw light on the *end* for the sake of which the speech is made." "The special form which a discussion may assume depends on the special *object* in view." "Our conclusions should be composed and expressed for the sake of *effect*." As to vocabulary, "we are to use the best words in the *circumstances*." "Mere verbal power is one thing. Mental power *transmitted* through appropriate language is another."

The writer of this notice for a short time taught rhetoric in the College of New Jersey, was not satisfied with the text-books in use, and, feeling the need of better, urged Professor Hunt, on his appointment to the chair of the department, to prepare a book on the method above described. After the patient labors of many years it is finished and in our hands. But allowing his personal interest in the author and the volume, he is conscious of no partiality in commending the book to the attention of teachers and students, and to writers and speakers. He is confident that a careful study of it will be rewarding even to those who have been well taught and have learned much by experience.

Joseph T. Duryea.

BALZAC. By EDGAR EVERTSON SALTUS. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1884.

It is surprising that in the country of novel readers one hears so seldom the name of the inventor of the modern novel. French novels are as much read here as in France. The latest and the worst are in great demand. This discriminating and finely written analysis of Balzac's work should encourage lovers of French light literature to go to the fountain head. Mr. Saltus appreciates Balzac at every point; his artistic perfection of detail; his return and his fidelity to nature; his wonderful construction of an entire society; and, greater still, what he happily calls his "discovery of woman," — all are dwelt upon in a style which would give interest to a less fruitful theme.

The explanation of the scheme of the "Comédie Humaine" is full of suggestions of its greatness, and he disposes of the claims of those who consider it immoral in few words. "In his books he has, it is true, agreeably painted the seductions of vice, but its contagious and destructive effects are rigorously exposed; and through all the struggles of his characters probity, purity, and self-denial are alone triumphant. In what then does his immorality consist? In his vast conception it was necessary, he explained, here to signalize an abuse and here to point out an evil; but every writer who has an aim and who breaks a fresh lance in the domains of thought is invariably considered immoral. Socrates was im-

moral ; Christ was immoral : both were persecuted by the people whom they reformed."

Mr. Saltus' own words will also best show his opinion of Balzac's return to nature. "'The Peau du Chagrin' marked the first return in the nineteenth century to the real and to the true ; it gave a fresh impulse to expiring literature, and constituted the corner-stone of the Realistic school, which has found such able exponents not only in the De Goncourts and Flaubert, but in Dickens, Thackeray, Tourgénéff, and a host of lesser lights."

Not less truly he characterizes Balzac's treatment of his female characters. In comparing him in this respect with other French writers from the middle ages down he says : "It is well to point out that when but the female was seen by these writers Balzac discovered the woman, — a difference surely as great as between the bottle and the wine." Again he says, "In his portraiture of women not a single type is lacking. Herein he is unexcelled and unsurpassable. That which Euripides considered as the most terrible of all misfortunes, and De Maistre nothing but a beautiful animal, found its most graphic expression through him."

The slight sketch of his life is all good, but especially so in what relates to his mode of work and habits of thought. The very names of the personages in the "Comédie Humaine" have a charm which makes it a pleasure to read the little sketch of the one hundredth representation of "Mercadet," translated from "Le Constitutionnel." Those bits of wisdom and wit chosen from the thousand great thoughts which crowd his pages are admirably calculated to show his peculiar genius and increase the number of his readers.

The complete list of his works, including those which were only projected, is of value to a lover of Balzac, and must have been difficult to obtain.

L. M. B.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

FROM THE CATHOLIC PUBLICATION SOCIETY COMPANY, NEW YORK.

A Catholic Dictionary, containing some account of the Doctrine, Discipline, Rites, Ceremonies, Councils, and Religious Orders of the Catholic Church. By William E. Addis, Secular Priest, Sometime Fellow of the Royal University of Ireland, and Thomas Arnold, M. A., Fellow of the same University. Pp. vi., 897. 1884.

FROM E. P. DUTTON AND COMPANY, NEW YORK.

History of the Canon of the Holy Scriptures in the Christian Church. By Edward Reuss, Professor in the University of Strasburg. Translated from the Second French Edition, with the Author's own Corrections and Revision, by David Hunter, B. D., late Scholar and Fellow in the University of Glasgow. Pp. xii., 404. 1884. \$3.00.

FROM J. B. LIPPINCOTT AND COMPANY, PHILADELPHIA.

The Mystery of Creation and of Man : to which is added A New View of Future Punishment. By L. C. Baker. Second edition. Pp. 229. 1884. \$1.00.



THE TRAVELERS

OF HARTFORD, CONN.

HAS

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------|
| ASSETS, | \$7,435,977.85 |
| LIABILITIES, | 5,567,487.27 |
| SURPLUS, | <u>\$1,868,490.58</u> |

Has Insured Over 1,000,000 Men,

*Or more than any other Company in the World, and Paid Claims on
ONE IN NINE OF THEM.*

PAID POLICY-HOLDERS, \$9,000,000,

IN SUMS FROM

43 Cents to \$13,000.

POLICY-HOLDERS ARE SECURED BY A

SPECIAL RESERVE of over \$5,200,000, NOT LIABLE

For Any Other Obligation.

*Has LARGER ASSETS in proportion to its Liabilities than any other
successful Company in America.*

WE OFFER TO ALL

A DEFINITE AMOUNT OF INSURANCE.— We do not charge a misleading premium for an uncertain principal, to be obtained only by assessing other Policy-holders after the claim matures.

LOWEST CASH RATES.— We do not charge an excessive price for the insurance, and then pay back part of the overcharge in so-called "Dividends." Companies which do this *never guarantee* dividends large enough to bring the cost of their insurance as low as that of THE TRAVELERS, and few of them ever accomplish it.

PLAIN CONTRACT.— We group all the conditions of the Policy Contract under a few clear heads, which all can understand, and no reasonable man can object to.

AMPLE SECURITY.— A Surplus of nearly two million dollars, safely invested, besides the reserve.

We have agents in every considerable village in the land. Apply without delay to any one of them, or to the Home Office at Hartford, for rates and other information.

JAMES G. BATTERSON, President.

RODNEY DENNIS, Secretary.

JOHN E. MORRIS, Assistant Secretary.

TWO IMPORTANT HISTORICAL BOOKS.

AN EPITOME

OF

Ancient, Mediæval, and Modern History.

By CARL PLOETZ.

Translated, with extensive additions, by WILLIAM H. TILLINGHAST, Assistant in Harvard University Library. With very full Index. Crown 8vo, \$3.00.

An admirably concise and accurate general history, embracing the important features in the records of all nations and peoples of which any account has come down to us. The great facts in history are here stated in their sequence, so that the reader of the book may gain a clear and adequate comprehension of the order and development and significance of the world's political, social, and moral history. It is excellently adapted for use in colleges, seminaries, academies, and schools, as well as for private libraries.

"Mr. Tillinghast's Ploetz is an Epitome of universal history exceeding the value of the original, and the best outline of which the teachers of general history can possibly make use in our colleges and secondary schools. Beside that, the Epitome is a most excellent reference book for the facts and dates of history. . . . Mr. Tillinghast's admirable edition of Ploetz's Epitome is entitled to the immediate attention of all persons who teach or study universal history. They cannot find a better manual." — *Boston Advertiser*.

THE HISTORY OF PRUSSIA

TO THE

Accession of Frederick the Great.

By HERBERT TUTTLE,

Professor in Cornell University. With Maps. Crown 8vo, \$2.25.

Prof. C. K. ADAMS, of the University of Michigan, writes: "The volume is everywhere marked with a thoroughness of scholarship and a sobriety of judgment that will commend itself to every historical student. The author's knowledge of the sources of information is very complete, and by a long residence in Berlin he was able to avail himself of such knowledge. Perhaps the most striking feature of the book is its impartiality. The author's judgments always incline to severity; but even when the reader is not able to accept his conclusions, he will not fail to admire the candor and fairness with which they are presented. The style is good, perhaps a little too stately to be popular, but one that from the first conciliates confidence in the author's desire to reach the truth and clearly present it. The work is a substantial addition to our literature, and one for which every person interested in the growth of Prussia should be grateful."

"He has some admirable qualities as a historian, the ability to take pains and get at the bottom of his subject; and a power of detachment from the notions and ideas of his age and country, which is of great value in a historian." — *The American* (Philadelphia).

♦♦ For sale by Booksellers. Sent, post-paid, on receipt of price by the Publishers,

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & CO., BOSTON, MASS.

IMPORTANT BOOKS.

By JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE.

TEN GREAT RELIGIONS.

PART I. AN ESSAY IN COMPARATIVE THEOLOGY, WITH AN INDEX.

8vo, \$3.00; half calf, \$5.50.

CONTENTS: Ethnic and Catholic Religions; Confucius and the Chinese; Brahmanism; Buddhism, or the Protestantism of the East; Zoroaster and the Zend Avesta; The Gods of Egypt; The Gods of Greece; The Religion of Rome; The Teutonic and Scandinavian Religion; The Jewish Religion; Mohammed and Islam; The Ten Religions and Christianity.

Nothing has come to our knowledge which furnishes evidence of such voluminous reading, such thorough study and research, and such masterly grasp of the real elements of these religions, as does the volume before us. James Freeman Clarke has accomplished a work here of solid worth. . . . The secret of the author's success, if we mistake not, turns largely on the fact that he has tried to

place himself in sympathy with the earnest and often heroic thinkers who originated these religious systems, and thus has come into a position to understand more correctly their mental struggles and the character of the results at which they arrived. — *Missionary Review* (Princeton).

A great body of valuable and not generally or easily accessible information. — *The Nation* (New York).

TEN GREAT RELIGIONS.

PART II. COMPARISON OF ALL RELIGIONS.

8vo, \$3.00; half calf, \$5.50.

CONTENTS: Introduction — Description and Classification; Special Types — Variations; Origin and Development of all Religions; The Idea of God in all Religions — Animism, Polytheism, Pantheism; Idea of God in all Religions — Ditheism, Tritheism, and Monotheism; The Soul and its Transmigrations, in all Religions; The Origin of the World, in all Religions; Evolution, Emanation, and Creation; Prayer and Worship in all Religions; Inspiration and Art in all Religions; Ethics in all Religions; Idea of a Future State in all Religions; The Future Religion of Mankind; Appendix.

There never was, perhaps, a time when a work like this of Dr. Clarke's could have been so well undertaken. The last few years have done much to throw light upon the religions of the world, and especially those of the East. Of these researches the author has availed himself, and he has given the world a book unique in design and execu-

tion; in its attempt to trace the doctrines we have named through all religions the work has no predecessor. — *The Churchman* (New York).

His rare learning, clear style, and the systematic clearness with which he abridges a vast amount of material are apparent to every one. — *Bibliotheca Sacra*.

COMMON-SENSE IN RELIGION.

A SERIES OF ESSAYS.

12mo, \$2.00.

CONTENTS: Common-Sense and Mystery; Common-Sense View of Human Nature; On the Doctrine Concerning God; The Bible and Inspiration; The True Meaning of Evangelical Christianity; The Truth about Sin; Common-Sense and Scripture Views of Heaven and Hell; Satan, according to Common-Sense and the Bible; Concerning the Future Life; The Nature of Our Condition Hereafter; Common-Sense View of the Christian Church; Five Kinds of Piety; Jesus a Mediator; The Expectations and Disappointments of Jesus; Common-Sense View of Salvation by Faith; On not being Afraid; Hope; The Patience of Hope; Love; The Brotherhood of Men.

Dr. Clarke has much to say which commends itself to our judgment and our feelings. There is a certain vigor in his thought, and an absolute clearness in his style, together with an evident and rugged honesty and strength of

conviction underlying all, which make him an impressive teacher, even when we cannot bring ourselves to accept his instructions. — *Congregationalist* (Boston).

* * * For sale by Booksellers, or sent, postpaid, on receipt of price by the Publishers,

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY, BOSTON, MASS.

THE
UNITED STATES MUTUAL
Accident Association,

320 and 322 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

*The Oldest and Largest Mutual Accident Company in
the World.*

18,000 Members. 3,000 Claims have been paid.

NO CONTESTED OR UNPAID CLAIMS.

Having no stockholders to provide for, and conducting its business at the minimum of expense, furnishes accident insurance at actual cost, or about one-half the rates of stock accident companies.

\$10,000 Insurance with \$50 a Week Indemnity costs about \$25 a year,

which may be paid at one time, if desired. Membership Fee, \$5 for each \$5,000 insurance, payable but once. To become a member write for an application blank.

EUROPEAN PERMIT WITHOUT CHARGE,

COVERING INDEMNITY ABROAD.

CHARLES B. PEET (of Rogers, Peet & Co.), *President.*

JAMES R. PITCHER,
Secretary.

The sermons deserve to rank with the noblest productions of modern times: they have the large sympathies of Beecher, the exegetical tact of Robertson, the literary finish of Vaughn, and the daring of Maurice.—BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1884.

THE FREEDOM OF FAITH.

BY

T. T. MUNGER,

Author of "On the Threshold." \$1.50.

NINTH EDITION.

. For sale by all Booksellers. Sent by mail, post-paid, on receipt of price by the Publishers,

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY, BOSTON, MASS.

.

n

r.

a

at

t

e

-

e

r.

.

88. F M HOLMES FURNITURE CO

THE ANDOVER REVIEW.

A new Religious and Theological Review, under the editorial control of EGBERT C. SMYTH, WILLIAM J. TUCKER, J. W. CHURCHILL, GEORGE HARRIS, EDWARD Y. HINCKS, Professors in Andover Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass., and with the coöperation and active support of all their colleagues in the Faculty, — Professors JOHN P. GULLIVER, JOHN P. TAYLOR, GEORGE F. MOORE, and FRANK E. WOODRUFF. The first number of the REVIEW appeared in January.

THE ANDOVER REVIEW, while appealing to professional readers, addresses itself directly to the religious public. *Theologically*, it advocates the principles and represents the method and spirit of progressive Orthodoxy. *Religiously*, the Editors carefully consider the increasing demands upon the church in its work of evangelism at home and abroad, in its educational functions, and in the administration of its charities. The religious condition of other countries is surveyed from time to time by competent writers.

There are also departments of Archæological and Geographical Notes, of Theological and Religious Intelligence, of Book Reviews, and Periodical Literature; and a department of Editorial Notes containing brief discussions of current issues and events.

CONTRIBUTORS.

Among the contributors may be mentioned :—

- | | |
|---|--|
| *Prof. EZRA ABBOT, D. D., LL. D. [Harvard]. | Rev. FRANCIS H. JOHNSON. |
| Rev. LYMAN ABBOTT, D. D. | Prof. GEORGE T. LADD, D. D. [Yale]. |
| Rev. WILLIAM W. ADAMS, D. D. | Rev. S. P. LEEDS, D. D. |
| Rev. E. S. ATWOOD, D. D. | Rev. ALEXANDER MCKENZIE, D. D. |
| Rev. A. F. BEARD, D. D. (France). | Prof. CHARLES M. MEAD, D. D. |
| Rev. L. O. BRASTOW, D. D. | Rev. DANIEL MERRIMAN, D. D. |
| Prof. FRANCIS BROWN [Union Theol. Sem.]. | Rev. WILLIAM E. MERRIMAN, D. D. |
| President M. H. BUCKHAM, D. D. [Univ. of Vermont]. | Rev. T. T. MUNGER, D. D. |
| *Rev. CHARLES T. COLLINS. | Prof. GEORGE H. PALMER [Harvard]. |
| Prof. EDWARD P. CROWELL, D. D. [Amherst]. | Rev. E. P. PARKER, D. D. |
| Rev. S. W. DIKE. | Rev. C. H. PARKHURST, D. D. |
| Rev. J. T. DURYEA, D. D. | Rev. TRUMAN M. POST, D. D. |
| Prof. WILLIAM W. EATON [Middlebury]. | Prof. CHARLES F. RICHARDSON [Dartmouth]. |
| Rev. Principal A. M. FAIRBAIRN, D. D. (England). | President E. G. ROBINSON, D. D., LL. D. [Brown]. |
| Rev. WILLIAM H. FENN. | President L. CLARK SEELYE, D. D. [Smith]. |
| President DANIEL C. GILMAN, LL. D. [Johns Hopkins Univ.]. | Prof. C. H. SMITH [Bowdoin]. |
| Rev. WASHINGTON GLADDEN, D. D. | Rev. NEWMAN SMYTH, D. D. |
| Rev. GEORGE A. GORDON. | Rev. GEORGE B. SPALDING, D. D. |
| Rev. Principal GEORGE MONRO GRANT, D. D. (Canada). | President J. F. STEVENSON, D. D., LL. B. (Canada). |
| Prof. G. STANLEY HALL [Johns Hopkins Univ.]. | Rev. HENRY M. STIMSON. |
| Prof. WILLIAM T. HARRIS. | Prof. J. HENRY THAYER, D. D. |
| ROWLAND HAZARD, Esq. | Rev. KINSLEY TWINING. |
| Rev. S. E. HERRICK, D. D. | Rev. JAMES G. VOSE, D. D. |
| | Rev. President JOSEPH WARD, D. D. [Yankton]. |
| | Rev. WILLIAM H. WARD, D. D. |
| | Rev. GEORGE H. WELLS, D. D. (Canada). |

Published monthly. Terms: \$3.00 a year; single copies, 30 cents.

Remittances should be made by money-order, draft, or registered letter, to

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY,

* Deceased.

4 PARK STREET, BOSTON, MASS.

Established 1780. SHAW, APPLIN & CO., Largest Manufacturers of PULPIT SUITS and LODGE FURNITURE in the United States, 27 Sudbury Street, Boston, Mass. *Catalogues furnished on application.*

Price \$50 to \$100.

F. M. HOLMES FURNITURE CO

MANUFACTURERS OF

FIRST-CLASS

Study, Office, and House

FURNITURE

OF ALL KINDS.



{ Holmes Roll-Top Desk.
Best Desk
ever made.



Holmes Reclining Chair.
Universally
Popular.

116 TREMONT STREET (Studio Building),

LEVI S. GOULD.

BOSTON.

FRANK A. PATCH.

STRAW MATTINGS

AND

WOODSTOCK CARPETS.

We are just opening an elegant line of

JOINTLESS MATTING,

FANCY COLORS,

SOLID COLORS

WHITE AND CHECK.

Also just received a fresh Stock of the celebrated

WOODSTOCK CARPET.

These make the most appropriate Furnishing for the

SUMMER-HOUSE IN THE COUNTRY OR AT THE SEA-SHORE.

JOEL GOLDTHWAIT & CO.

169 Washington Street,

BOSTON.

TEACHING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES.

THE ANDOVER REVIEW for April contains a Complete Translation of the Recently Discovered MS., TEACHING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES, by Rev. C. C. STARBUCK (the original Greek of important passages being given in the margin). With a full Synopsis and Critical Review of Bishop Bryennios' learned and exhaustive Introduction, by Professor EGBERT C. SMITH.

Price 30 cents.

"Its readers will appreciate highly the enterprise which has put this important volume before them so speedily and so well. . . . This number is the ablest of the four now issued. — *The Congregationalist*."

*** For sale by Booksellers and Newsdealers. Sent by mail, post-paid, on receipt of price by the Publishers,

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY, BOSTON, MASS.